The Other Phase of the Medal

A Critical Rejoinder
to
The Swarajists' Propaganda

BY

D. MADHAVA RAO

The Justice Printing Press,
Mount Road, Madras.
1926

Price] [12 As.

093
F07

The Other Phase :: of the Medal : :

A Critical Rejoinder to The Swarajists' Propaganda

BY

D. MADHAVA RAO

The Justice Printing Press,
Mount Road, Madras.
1926

Price] [12 As.

All Rights Reserved.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER.		PAGE.
	Preface	v
	Proem	vii
I.	The Elections' the thing	1
II.	Phalanxes at any Cost	7
III.	Modus-Sree-vaishnavendi	14
IV.	Swarajist Pogroms	22
V.	The Swarajist Stunt-Non-acceptance of Office	29
VI.	The Swarajist Water-Level	47
VII.	Not Unto an Adoni's Garden ...	57
VIII.	Hence our Duty	71
	Appendix A (1)	81
	Appendix B (2)	87
	Appendix B (1)	93

PREFACE.

The eight chapters of this book appeared in the columns of the "Justice". They have now been re-issued, with a covering introduction and appendix, in this pamphlet form. I thank Mr. K. V. Menon, the editor of the 'Justice", for permitting me to re-produce them here.

The copyright of these articles is mine. If any one desires to translate this pamphlet into any Vernacular my permission has to be obtained.

This pamphlet has been issued with the object of exposing the "rotten hollow" of the Swarajya Party and particularly of the Madras branch. It aims to place before the reader ample material for discrediting the Swarajya Party and for affording an insight into the machiavellism of the Swarajist leaders. And besides this pamphlet is written with a fervent anticipation that the reader after perusing its pages would render his best help by the Non-Swarajist parties at the coming General Elections. Thus the highest reward for my labours in writing these pages would be in the thorough defeat of the Swarajists and their "more than two Kings of Brentford" during the November elections. Let me, however, now say, Spero Meliora.

I offer my best thanks to Mr. J. S. Kannappar, the talented editor of the "Dravidan" and Mr. V. Ramaswamy Pillai for the interest they have evinced in this production.

Before closing this preface I have to acknowledge my grateful thanks to my friend Mr. Mahmud Mukkaram, B.A., B.L., High Court Vakil, for the help and assistance he has been rendering me. I must own I am deeply touched by his uniform courtesy and kindness.

"Govinda Vilas"
Triplicane, Madras,
15*th of September* 1926.

D. MADHAVA RAO

PROEM

In offering the accompanying pages to the public for its careful perusal, I feel I need make no particular apology. For belonging as I do to the Indian National Party, I own that it is my duty to carry on a vigorous campaign against the Swarajya Party's propaganda, especially because I am fully convinced that just at present the intrinsic and immediate aspects of our political progress are in utter contradiction to the political ideals of the Swarajya Party. In fact from day to day we have been witnessing "developments" in our politics which offer an uncompromising challenge to the very creed and practices of the Swarajists. Of them the communal tension is most prominent. In its face the Swarajya Party is utterly imbecile, and it looks as though even the mature political wisdom of some of its sponsors would become a Dead Sea Fruit when called upon to tackle the peculiar national fever engendered by the communal mistrust between the Hindus and the Mussalmans. Indeed just like Siegfried moving towards the chamber of Chriemhilda, the Swarajya Party is marching about from post to pillar and pillar to post in the surcharged atmosphere of communal unrest. At this rate the Swarajya Party would soon come against some huge rock of political reactionarism. Then it cannot escape going to ruin. That thus the Swarajya Party was on the way to disintegration, nay it was bound to disintegrate, was pointed out by me in December 1925 in my pamphlet on "Responsive Co-operation." And between then and now, that is, between December 1925 and August 1926, the validity

of my forecast has been amply proved. I therefore now assert that the safety plank beneath the Swarajya Party's programme has become incubus. To depend on it any longer for a sustaining vitality in the country's contest with a foreign bureaucracy would be ridiculous in the extreme. That is why the high-falutin of Swarajist war-cries do not now in any sane person evoke his enthusiasm or touch his conscience. They are to-day looked upon as 'vulgated doctrines of swashbucklers, concessionaries, and petty tyrants'. Therefore it is that in the following pages I wish to make out that in reality the Swarajya Party from its very inception has been dowered with 'the facies hyppocratica'. This fact affords us another reason for our not adhering to the dictates of the Swarajya Party, which are fast becoming a new variety of Ukases. Under such circumstances is it too much to ask of every honest patriot not to heed the Swarajya Party's propaganda, but to follow 'the practical limitations' of the non-Swarajist Parties, like the Indian Nationalist, the Responsivist, and the Justiceite, which know what it is to write on the wall and to carve out on water. This plea I have supported with many convincing reasons that have been set forth in the accompanying pages.

In this connection I have been forced to speak in quite harsh terms of the Congress. To do so has been extremely painful to me because of the affection and esteem I bear for some of the Congress worthies. But personal loyalties ought not to, and cannot, interfere with the dictates of conscience and the imperative call of duty especially in the larger spheres of service by the public. My chagrin against the Congress Swarajya Party has been intensified by the reckless, heedless, outrance of the Madras Swarajists. Even to think of them is disgust-

ing. One cannot but loathe their insouciance. Especially the mordant political jaggedness of their Leader gets on our nerves. But, however, there is this consolation that under his inspiration the Swarajya Party is fast coming to its rut. Such a pass was anticipated by me long ago, and in the article entitled Swarajist Pogroms I did warn this Swarajist leader of the absolute *impasse* to which he was driving his party. And I am glad that subsequent events have borne out my words. The last Madras Corporation Elections (4th of August) recorded a total, full, and complete defeat of the Madras Swarajists. Let this Swarajist defeat serve as a warning to the Swarajists themselves and as an inspiration to those who have had the courage to set their faces against the Swarajist intransigeances. I say this because the Madras Swarajists deserve at our hands no quarter and no mercy. They cannot even conceive of 'the old antithesis on which St. James waxed eloquent, of faith versus works.' They cannot even make bold to conceive of Government in Herbert Spencer's dictum of anarchy plus the policeman. They have especially under a Sriman's leadership outraged the very fundamentals of the Congress creed and precept, and have demonstrated their utter bankruptcy of political foresight. This party in Madras has no saving grace and one cannot think of it even somewhat kindly, because it has ceased to contain the high idealism of a L. G. Khare, or the fervent patriotism of a Pundit Jawharlal Nehru or even the whimsical sincerity of a Goswami.

The leader of such a group is about to preside over the Congress destinies. To him, no doubt, his elevation to the Presidential Chair of the Congress would mean the summum bonum of his public life. But to us it means the exaltation of a nerveless petti foging Laputan to a pontifical illuminati—of course, perhaps, by a maddening crowd

This is all. But the consequences arising out of it are serious and grave. Because our anticipation of the future on the basis of the past indicates to us that in all probability Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar as president of the Congress, will proceed from blunder to blunder till he and with him the Congress interests get fizzled out of all their vitality. That predicament is bound to be gloomier than what it might have been, for we learn that even Lala Lajput Rai has seceded from the Swarajya Party, which in fact is the vital projection of the Congress organisation. Where Lala Lajput Rai could not function, where Pundit Motilaljee in the heart of hearts must be feeling quite sick of remaining any longer, where Pundit Malavyajee sees a field strewn full with wasted labour, Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar cannot be expected either to raise a shrine or invoke the ghost. Moreover, Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar lacks that arresting personality, full of vitality, grace, and incomparable eloquence, of Mrs. Naidu, which alone can be a factor working for cohesion and amity between different political groups.

But, however, there is this fact that even if Mr. Iyengar were a political Soloman he could not have helped the Swarajya Party from disintegration. With the deflection of Lala Lajput Rai the Swarajya Party has come on its dotage. It has no longer any vitality, no vision, and no faith. It cannot claim any longer that it alone among the various political parties in the country has the will and the heart to sustain the national temper both in its mood of violent protest and altruistic acquisitiveness. It cannot to-day make good its claim that it alone as 'Constantine of old is able to make anarchy the purifier and preserver of the State.' It cannot proclaim that *Influence is Government*. From its atmosphere of rarefied idealism it has now descended to the earth earthy. It can no longer brag the imminence of its coming political

avathar which would sweep clean the dirt and dust of self-aggrandisement and personal exploitation from the road of the country's progress. Indeed the Swarajya Party is in its dotage. What it needs at our hands is "decent burial". Let us conduct the last rites in such a way that we leave no rancour or malice behind us.

Thus now at least the reader can assure himself that he would not be serving the interests of the country by helping the Swarajya Party which is almost on its extinction. But, however, this spectacle of a renowned party's disintegration ought not to loom too much in our attention. We all have got to become sensitively alive to the more urgent state of affairs. On one side we must recognise that the Congress, viz., the Swarajya Party, is no longer at its apogee. It is, on the other hand, in a moribund rut. In opposite direction the communal consciousness is wide awake. Not only that, it has gathered a tone and a vigour that are as virile as they are unexpected. Side by side with this, and in a large measure owing to it, are floating now 'the ancestral voices of war'. This psychology has given to our political chess-board a weird and malignant megalomania. And what have been the consequences thereof? Let us note them in the following words of a leading daily in India :—

"The requisition signed by Lala Lajput Rai and many others of the All-India Congress Committee, which is at present in course of circulation, is of great political significance. The requisition proposes that a special session of the All-India Congress Committee should be convened to consider the desirability of the Congress as such keeping aloof from the forthcoming elections

and that in all communal questions such as music before mosques and the ratio of representation of the various communities in the public services, Congress men should be at liberty to vote as they like....Failing, presumably, an endorsement of their proposal by the Congress Executive those who have signed the requisition urge the holding of a special session of the Congress to be held in September "to consider the present situation and give a lead to the country". A straw shows how the wind blows, and Lala Lajput Rai's requisition is a clear indication of the determination of a strong section of the extremists to fight the forthcoming Assembly and Council elections on purely communal lines. The trend of extremist political opinion towards this conclusion has been apparent for some time. The repudiation of the Bengal pact was one of the first signs, but it has remained for Lala Lajput Rai to come into the open and boldly proclaim that the only issue of importance before the electors is the communal one. We do no know what attitude the Congress will take up with regard to this latest development of Indian politics; it is unlikely that it will quietly sit down and vote itself a political nonentity, but it seems to us that it will be borne down by the force of circumstances over which it has no control. For the time being the Congress has ceased to be a party of political significance. Its old cry of non-co-operation and the later Swarajist cries of immediate self-government, wrecking of the Reforms, have ceased, as we have already pointed out, to be live issues in the political world of India. The Swarajists made a last bid for a slogan to keep their party alive by returning to the Assembly—the majority of them at least—to throw out the Currency Bill, but the Government's agreement to postpone consideration of the Bill denied them even that consolation, and their walk-out to meet the electors

has been as undignified and humiliating as their walk-in. Lala Lajput Rai talks glibly of the necessity for the Responsivists and the Swarajists uniting on the basis of the Sabarmati Pact, which permits the Swarajists to hold office ; but we do not see how this is going to influence the fate of the two parties one iota it the communal issue is to be the deciding factor at the elections. Both the Secretary of State and the Viceroy have acknowledged the fact that the communal problem is the dominating factor in Indian politics to day and both, especially the Viceroy, had appealed to the various party-leaders by precept and practice to cultivate a better spirit towards each other and among their followers. It is deplorable, therefore, to find that a section of those leaders far from attempting to soothe communal feeling, are bent on using it as a political issue of the first magnitude. It is devoutly to be hoped that by the time November arrives wiser counsels will have prevailed."

In the face of such political estrangement the Swarajist wrecking and other negations are absolutely effete. They cannot set their face against a most firmly entrenched bureaucracy that still retains, in ample measure, prudence, good sense, and fair play. Therefore, it is not possible for the Swarajists to wreck the very citadels of power and initiative. For effecting such a programme at this juncture the Swarajists have neither the vitality nor the inspiration. Consequently the Swarajists cannot make out any reasonable plea for the public showing its preference exclusively in their behalf. Moreover, these present day Swarajists as the protagonists of the Congress have most contemptuously forgotten the very faith of the first founders of the Congress. They have almost outraged the supremest convictions of those patriots who gave the Congress all of their

best. The labours of those doyens of the Congress, who now rest beyond the grave, the present day Swarajists remember not, nor do they demur to subvert them. These Swarajists might pride themselves that they have clean forgotten-quantum mutatis ab illo-the central creed of those pioneers. But the country at large is shaking off the spell caused by the Swarajists and is fast turning round the "moderation" of Dadhaboy and Gokhale and Mheta.

Such a revulsion of the popular feeling against the Swarajists deserves to be encouraged and nurtured. Because in the face of the latest developments in Indian politics, the Swarajya Party is decidedly ineffectual and at the same time it affords by its peculiar intransigeances a handle for die-hard reactionarism in Great Britain to make popular its propaganda of unfriendliness against Indian aspirations as a counter move to Swarajists' irreconcilability which would be interpretted as a most unreasonable obstinacy on the part of the entire Indian people. In this way any fresh lease of Swarajist's activities would surely blast away all the chances of a modicum 'of a further grant' that might be ours by the time the Statutory Commission makes its final recommendations. This entire gist of our stakes has been fully discussed in the last two chapters of this pamphlet, and I do not here wish to repeat the arguments I have recorded there. I only earnestly request my readers to carefully weigh the pros and cons of the case I have made out in behalf of the central creed adopted by me. Anyway I feel I have to repeat here this much, that as 'practical politicians' it behoves us not to support the doctrinaire and impractical creed of the Swarajists. This duty on our part is urgent, essential, and almost austere. Of course, to openly stand up against the Congress Swarajists requires not a little of

courage and determination to fight against odds. And therefore perhaps it is that only a few even of the Moderate school of Indian politics have come out into the open for giving the Swarajists as best a fight as they possibly can. In this connection we all have to acknowledge that the only party in South India that is contesting the Swarajists is the Justice Party. And the Justice Party has been fortunate in having Mr. K. V. Menon as the editor of the "Justice". Through its columns Mr. Menon has been giving to the non-brahmin movement a most healthy impetus and a bracing freshness. Largely to his uncorruptible convictions and sustained energy the "Justice" has put forth innumerable fights against all the vested interests of the Swarajists. Indeed I am glad that the *Justiceites* in Madras have been lucky in counting upon the services of Mr. Menon, whose high talents have all along been an asset to Indian journalism. This non-brahman party alone deserves the credit for offering the Congress enthusiasts in South India the most determined, courageous and unflinching opposition. Perhaps, the Justice Party's manouvres may not be all too ethical, but they are any day more honourable, more decent, and certainly much cleaner than the methods and manouvres of the Madras Swarajists,whose debacle of intrigue and personal calumny is getting exposed in the recent Corporation Elections, particularly in that of the Triplicane division. (Is it not, I ask, extremely regrettable that a person like Mr. Vyasa Rao should have been treated by the Madras Swarajists, especially their Leader, in a way that was simply unseamy, so unseamy as to drag down all the ethical reputation of the Swarajists to the ditch-water level?) As such all the well-wishers of the Non-Swarajist political parties in India must acknowledge their indebtedness to the Justice Party. No doubt the Justice Party is not completely above board. But thanks to the splendid services of

Sir A. P. Patro and just a few like him the angularities in that party are rounded off. With the mature guidance of Sir Patro, the Justice Party is in a proper league and on the right tract, and as such its labours, especially because of the kind of guidance it has, are bound to function into something which we all should ungrudgingly desire. Once more I have to repeat that in South India it is only the Justiceites that are resisting the Swarajists and not the Rt. Hon'ble. Mr. Sastry with his philosophic detachment as effective as Dr. Besant's coming Messiah, not Sir Sivaswamy Ayyar whose mugwumpury is so mugwumpish as to be innocuous, and not those others who in the rarefied atmosphere of the olympians have been trading on their 'sweet reasonableness'.

Leaving apart these personal references by which I mean absolutely no disrespect, I wish now to urge upon my readers another consideration. It is this, that in our campaign against the Swarajists, we must not mind the insinuation cast by the Swarajist protagonists against us that we are in an unholy alliance with the bureaucracy and the members of the European Association. We have, however, to repudiate the charge that our alliance with the European non-officials and officials is unholy. We need make no apology for claiming the guidance and friendship of men like Lord Ronaldshay, Sir Basil Blackett, Sir Lindsay, and Sir Leslie Wilson. Nor should we deem it unworthy of us to have our hands linked in mutual forbearance and amity with those of men like Sir M. Hailey and Sir William Birdwood. These persons mean well by us and our country. True no doubt they are liable to the prejudices of human nature, and as such with them too possibly blood would be thicker than water. But nevertheless

they have been sincerely trying, not with any condescension, to befriend us with courtesy, knowledge, forethought, and forbearance. Their services in our behalf might not be just at present quite discernible But that is no reason why we should not even when we are in the heat of political controversy, recollect that aspect. Thus, would it not be ungrateful of us not to acknowledge with what consummate ability Sir Basil Blackett has been laying the foundation of fiscal autonomy on whose prosperity alone the self-governing India of a future day is to rest? Space does not permit me to speak more about it here, but in my forthcoming book, entitled "The Still Unlost Dominion," which will be published in the next autumn, I am writing at length about the great services of Sir Basil. Coming to the central point I wish to urge, I have to state that we ought not to discredit and attribute nefarious motives to all expressions of British sympathy in behalf of our cause. More so because such expressions of sympathy and determination have now lost the sting of Dalhousiean ring of old. Therefore we ought not to look upon an epitome like *British greatness on Indian happiness* as only a catch phrase condescendingly uttered because of noblesse oblige. This is all what I can earnestly plead.

To this proem, and the pages that follow, I am sure there would be much hostile criticism from a section of the Indian Press that looks upon every non-Swarajist as the enemy of the country and traitor to its cause. This Press will not retort the arguments set forth in these pages with any convincing reasons or any relevant counter arguments to the ones put forth by me, but it would come off with a general reposte containing serried references to the old and the new Testaments, to medieval mythology, and contemporary fiction. In attacking this pamphlet, in all probability, it will not resort to cogent and relevent arguments but would indulge in caricaturing

with its own range of liberal abuse. But then I have this consolation that this section of the Press does not really control or effect the political progress of the country; it is only like "Abernethy, the famous doctor, who when asked why he indulged himself with all the habits he warned his patients against as unhealthy, replied that his business was that of a direction post which points the way to a place, but does not go thither itself"; and as such to all its unreasonable criticism of this pamphlet I can say, Ira Furor brevis est. Nevertheless, I ask of my readers this much of indulgence at their hands, that they should, without being prejudiced by the imponderabilia of such a Press, dispassionately weigh the justice behind the gravamen set forth in these pages. Should they be convinced in my favour, might they not then render their help in this anti-Swarajist campaign?

I know that this appeal of mine will not fall altogether on deaf ears, nor that it would be a cry in the wildernes. Because I am aware that in the medley of confusion of political issues there are persons with clarity of keen judgment who see them in the right perspective. Two such persons in Madras I can name. Remaining behind the scenes and avoiding a flashy lime light publicity, Mr. S. V. Ramaswamy Mudaliar and Mr. Md. Muazzam, B. A., B. L., High Court Vakil, have been retwisting the distorted contours of our politics to their correct shape. Their faith is admirable because it is none other than that what Indians now need aspire for is not fire-eating aud whacking of platitudes but sober nationalism and decent opposition. And their work resting on such a faith is most praiseworthy as it is all so unostentatious. They and others like them deserve of our highest praise. To them the people and the Government must owe their best thanks.

Note.—By the Leader of the Swarjya Party I refer to Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar.

The Other Phase Of The Medal

I

THE ELECTIONS' THE THING

Anti-Panagalism the creed—Election the sole obsession—False pretensions and claims.

In a series of articles I wish to offer to my readers a true and critical picture of the Madras Swarajists which is not being admitted by the Swarajists themselves. By now the readers of the "Justice" would have been accustomed to the various attitudes, poses, and professions adopted and recounted from time to time by the Swarajists in the Southern Presidency. In this way the Madras Swarajists have finished striking the medal of their political creed; and after burnishing the medal brightly with much high-falutin of popular slogans and grandiloquent shibboleths, the Madras Swarajists are pointing that side of it to the public and are doing their every bit to make the public really fall in love with its luscious lustre. But that medal has indeed another side which the Madras Swarajists scrupulously refrain from ever pointing out. Its aspect is not even as so much as hinted at. Why it is not shown up, the articles that will follow will easily explain.

That other side of the medal is in ugly contradiction to the burnished one held aloft by the Swarajist leaders. On it one will find an index of its makers' soul and outlook. It will tell its own tale. What that is cannot be

recounted just in the course of a couple of columns. It must be narrated from week to week. But, however, in this article I can just depict some of the broad outlines discernible on this side of the Swarajist medal. Foremost among them is that to the Madras Swarajists the real objective of their political efforts and travail is not the emancipation of their country, not the attainment of Swaraj, not the unification of the political forces in the Presidency under the domination of the Congress banner. It is simply the overthrow of the now popular half in the dyarchical Government, and in its place the installation of something else. In this way the ultimate and the immediate concern of the Madras Swarajists is the problem of how to tackle the Panagal Ministry. Compared with the ulterior problems of Indian Nationalism, for whose solution the Swarajists say they are devoting their very careers, the real objective of the Madras Swarajists must seem quite dwarfish. To admit this fact would be a type of political honesty which the Madras Swarajists have never been accustomed to. That is why in their side of the medal this vital concern of theirs is finely glossed over with many pretensions in behalf of those ideals for whose realisation Mahatma Gandhi and only just a few other honest men are known to be labouring with a devotion and a sacrifice that call forth anyone's unstinted admiration. To put this fact in plainer words, the Madras Swarajists have been saying that they are the trustees of the Congress, that they have been out for carrying through the Congress ideals, and that they have been pursuing the Congress-mandate. Consequently the Madras Swarajists do affirm their faith in the Hindu-Muslim unity as the only solvent of the country's many ills ; they do speak in very feeling terms about the 'untouchables' ; they invariably assert that as Congressmen they know not any caste or social demarcation.

Owing to these reasons they say that they are keen about courting the suffrage of the people; and they lay their claims for receiving the peoples' votes on the plea that they alone have been working for India's Swaraj. But really the Madras Swarajists are incapable of preparing the country for the coming political Avatar which the Congress has been promising us in the very near future. The fact is that the Madras Swarajists have not turned their little finger in any practical proposal that would help the constructive programme of the Congress. Untouchability, Hindu-Muslim Unity, and Khaddar can be on their lips, and just half-a-dozen references to them in any day's speeches are enough of a service in their behalf. If the Madras Swarajists deny this statement and still affirm that they have been striving their most in behalf of the "constructive" programme of the Congress, they should be looked upon as very sophisticated men who have amazing standards of veracity and truth. Because from the many facts that would be mentioned in the course of this series any dispassionate reader can clearly understand that to the Madras Swarajists the Congress creed and work in behalf of that creed mean the coming elections and the elections alone. The Madras Swarajists have put their entire heart and soul on the November elections. Their much boasted and very cleverly advertised perspective of the nation's political interests is confined within the narrow limits of a coming General Election. Beyond the elections they have no interests overlapping the Council exigencies, no ambitions, and certainly no vision. All their activities are just for one sole purpose—that of having a leading majority in the General Elections. Therefore it is no exaggeration to state that the nationalism, the patriotism, and the social philanthropy of the Madras Swarajists are the electioneering weapons of a body of clever men with ample political ambitions that can equate themselves with even the pre-

sent 'defective' form of dyarchical Government. Their adherence to the Congress programme is a convenient peg to which they could hang their chances of a good 'return' in November. Of course, they have some warranty for concentrating their attention on the elections, as the Congress does expect its adherents to ensure the return of the Swarajists. But beside the election issue the Congress does expect its adherents to equally concentrate their attention on some of those problems which are vital in the interests of the country. But the Madras Swarajists are incapable of demonstrating their capacity or zeal for anything other than the elections. For the Madras Swarajists the elections' the thing. This fact need not surprise any shrewd observer of the Madras Swarajists. The Madras Swarajists, especially their leaders, are men who, by virtue of their up-bringing and mental outlook, have been incapable of any heroic, high, endeavour, great enterprise, or rich vision. They are simply incapable of well organised resistance to any avowed political tyranny or social wrong. They are just average clever men who can manipulate 'influences' and 'factors' in any election atmosphere. More than this much, would any sane person expect anything from the Madras Swarajists? (I do not wish to drag in 'names' but I have to.) Who would believe that men like Mr. S. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar, Mr. Satyamoorthy, Mr. Prakasam, Mr. Sami Venkatachellam, and Mr. Shafee Mahomed have the stuff in them to play the role of the emancipators of our country? Who would concede that these men have the guts in them to offer sincere and effective resistance to any reactionarism that might be standing in the way of the country's political advancement? Who could trust that these men have the mettle in them to be the evangelists of a newer and better social order? Which of us is so foolish as to believe that under the leading of a gentleman like Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar these persons

would be able to replace the British bureaucracy in the governance of the country?

These Madras Swarajists are not made of any such stuff. Yet they are professing great accomplishments. By their talk they affirm that they are the persons who have been consolidating the Congress ideals. But really they are incapable of fulfilling the expectations of the Congress. All that they are capable of is to handle the coming elections. That is why their real interests are centred within the elections. Their real objective is the dethronement of the Panagal Ministry. This is all. But this much is couched in a language of high-soaring idealism. The eloquence of their words is a mere camouflage. We ought not to forget this. In spite of all the thaumaturgy of the Madras Swarajists, we must note that what the Madras Swarajists stand for is not the fulfilment of the Congress programme but the desire to see the present Ministry overthrown. That this is their real end in view can be proved and inferred by many incidents that have happened in the last few months.

Of course, inherently there is nothing awkward in any group of men being quite interested in the elections. There is nothing to prevent the Madras Swarajists from their evincing a live interest in the elections. But the fact about the Madras Swarajists and the elections is that they are trying their level best to come out successful in the elections on false pretensions and claims that have no foundation. The Madras Swarajists are courting the suffrage of the electorate on the ground that they have pledged themselves to fulfil the Congress programme; and in this connection they are asserting that they have been serving only the Congress and not themselvesy More than this they have been pleading that they are seeking the suffrage of the electorate only because they

know that in their hands alone the interests of the Congress through legislative enactments could be secure.

But these claims of the Madras Swarajists are quite pretensious. Except by verbal professions, in no way have the Madras Swarajists demonstrated their capacity for achieving the national unification on the Congress lines. They are incapable of putting into practice the Congress programme. Nevertheless, they profess as the champions of the Congress. The Madras Swarajists are merely exploiting the name and prestige of that organisation. It behoves us to know in an unequivocal manner that the Madras Swarajists are keen only about the coming elections, that they wish to replace the present Ministry, and that they are going about this work on false pretensions and misleading promises. We must note that the interests of the Congress are not safer in the hands of the Madras Swarajists than they could be in those of non-Congressmen ; and therefore no premium ought to be set by us on the Madras Swarajists for their professed love of, and adherence to, the Congress.

For the present let us remember that for Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar and his compeers the elections' the thing. If so, what next ?

II

Phalanxes at any Cost.

The Madras Swarajists' Machiavellism—Its adroit nature and the uses to which it is put—Wealth and 'influence' alone the sole criterion of the Madras Swarajists—Not true Congressmen but mere political fibbers the real chelas of the Madras Swarajist Leader—The camouflage of a national nonbrahmin implication of the Swarajya Party in Madras.

In my last article I pointed out that the Madras Swarajists, under the guidance and inspiration of Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar, were straining every nerve for the defeat of the Ministerialists at the coming elections. Under these circumstances, very naturally, the Madras Swarajists have thrown to the winds the very fundamentals of the Congress aspirations. This crusade of anti-Panagalism is broadcasted by the Madras Swarajists in a heavily garbed motif, viz., that of disinterested service, devotion to the country's cause, and efforts in behalf of Swaraj. Consequently the public, and especially the Congress enthusiasts outside South India, are yet to know that the patriotic efforts of the Madras Swarajists are nothing more than a cleverly undertaken political philandering. But when once the public realise that the much advertised Swarajists in Madras have been mere petty philanderers dangling after their own ends and have not been the 'soldiers in the battle for freedom', the myth of the past many months will be glaringly exposed in its hideous reality. Then, indeed, would the true Congress

patriots elsewhere in the country come to know how badly the Madras Swarajists have let go the substantive interests of the Congress and how indeed the Sreeman's following has exploited the Congress for small ends and egregious angularities. But that day, when the veil will be lifted and the patriotic devotee of the Congress led before the mock idol, is still to come. But come it must—and it will.

Anyway, it behoves us here to remember that the Madras Swarajists' trumpetings are a clever blending of fiction and fabrication. Thus, for Mr. Iyengar and his *chelas* the need of the hour is how to thwart Panagal and his stronghold, how to replace the present Ministry, and how thereafter wear the iconoclast's laurels. This supreme need of theirs, they feel, has to be achieved through a machiavellism of a very adroit nature. And machiavellism in all its shades—moral, intellectual, earth earthy—being quite native to a type of Dravidian culture and up-bringing, it has been thriving under the kindly nurture of the Madras Swarajists—thriving as luxuriously as the palm in Kerala. And out of such a machiavellism the Madras Swarajists have reared their phalanxes, and have reared them at all costs. These phalanxes brought into being at a very heavy price of a want of political fair-play and moral candour have their own tale to tell. Now to a brief narration of them.

Before we proceed further it is well we know that the Madras Swarajist Leader has formed these phalanxes with a view to rout the forces of the Ministerialists at the coming elections. This urgent need of his has been reinforced by him with many a compromise and many a concession. These compromises and concessions have been made by the Swarajist Leader with an adroitness that seems to count upon no decency in its calculations.

However that may be, the fact remains that Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar has strained every nerve and allowed many a 'principle' to go flop in trying to form a phalanx of Swarajist candidates who could beat the Ministerialists at the elections. The great worldling that he is, and one who has known the sweets of a bank balance, Mr. Iyengar has taken excellent care to see that he, in the name of the Madras Swarajya Party, adopts as his nominees only such persons as have a long purse behind them. This zealous concern for the 'plutocratic bosses' is not in itself open to any objection at our hands; but the real implication we wish to make out here is that this Swarajist leader is keen on getting round his banner not men who in virtue of their faith, inclinations, and capacity are really devoted to the Congress, but those who possess the great and only virtue of being rich and with whom love for the Congress is only a lip testimony. In other words, the camouflage this leader is nourishing is this ipse dixit, that any rich person who merely professes sympathy for the Congress—be it ever so much intellectual and that too from the undiscovered (?) fourth plane—is a genuine and ardent Congressman. But who would ex-cathedra grant the above Sreemanian juxtaposition? Therefore we protest that in many instances wealthy persons have been preferred to represent the Congress, but not the genuine Congress 'workers' who are not rich. In this way the selection of Congress candidates has come to be the most important concern of the Madras Swarajists; but even these members of the party are not expected to poke their noses too much into this 'affair,' for this reason that it has become a 'reserved' subject which the deity of 'Amzad Bagh", alone is felt competent to administer.

What we have to make plain is this: how comes it about that in Madras Swarajism 'wealth' and 'influence' alone have gained currency and 'zealous work' 'integrity' and 'loyalty to the Congress' have become bad coin? Such an amazing state of affairs is readily explained. The explanation is this:—What the Madras Swarajist Leader and his inner circle of compeers wish to enact in this year is not the triumph of those men who are the real representatives of the Congress but of those who could achieve this much and no more—viz the defeat of the Ministerialists. Secondly the Madras Swarajists have wisely known that to-day in South India, thanks to the way in which they have worked the Congress programme, the 'Congress influence' by itself is absolutely puerile, powerless, and ineffective, and that hence it cannot penetrate the Ministerialist ranks, nor much less defeat them. When 'Congress influence' could not be equal for meeting honestly and squarely Panagalism in an open contest, other considerations have been forestalled in its place. Consequently we find that the Congress loyalists without a decent purse have been put on the shelf and mere Congress fibbers who are rich have been set up on the arena. By doing so there can be no doubt that the real interests of the Congress would be blasted away. But what would our Madras Swarajist leaders care if even damnation were to stare the Congress in its face if it is guaranteed to them that at the November elections the Ministerialists are not the leading group? For contesting the Ministerialists the Madras Swarajists feel that no factor is too mean or too compromising. Yet these Swarajists have been prating a lot of patriotism, sacrifice, and devotion to the Congress. What should we say of these Swarajist leaders who have been deliberately, knowingly, and wantonly preferring fibbers to honest Congress

patriots simply on the score that the former happen to be wealthy and 'influential'? Should not such leaders be condemned as tomahawkers of the Congress interests?

Perhaps the reader might feel that what all has been said above is only by way of a clever propagandistic 'demarche.' But it is not so. Many an instance I could give pointing to the ways of the Madras Swarajist leaders. Anyhow the reader will take it from me that in their propaganda in behalf of the Congress at the coming elections the Madras Swarajist leaders have been agreeing with Carthill's remark that any kind of loyalty, if not well watered with the streams of Pactolus, is apt to droop. Necessarily from such a standpoint the Madras Swarajits leaders have been finding it a hard job to discover the right kind of men to represent the Congress at the coming elections. In fact, they have been forced to go a begging for 'men'. Their struggle in this behalf is quite pathetic. In one case the Swarajist Leader had to go and cajole a certain gentleman and persuade him to stand as a Congress candidate for the coming Corporation Elections. But this person, who is influential in commercial circles, declined to join the Swarajists and he even told the Swarajist Leader that his sympathies were with the Responsivists and not with the Swarajist bravados, fire-eaters, and wreckers. But this obduracy on his part the Swarajist Leader did not mind. He still wooed him, and wooed him even when he knew that he had written or intended to write urgent letters to the Bombay Responsivists asking them to come over to Madras to organise a Party here in opposition to the Swarajists. Perhaps because that wooing was done with the help of some old cunning fox among the Swarajists, that gentleman at the end consented to be mated with them. With the same cunning the Swarajist Leader has achieved other wonders elsewhere. In many places he has cleverly veiled

the brahminophobia in his Swarajism and has succeeded in making nonbrahmin gentlemen espouse his cause. This linking of the hand with that of the nonbrahmin gentlemen is only as a sop to Cerberus, because in these instances the Nonbrahmin gentlemen who have been deliberately set up by the Swarajist Leader do not happen to be sincere Congressmen. Genuine and ardent Nonbrahmin Congressmen there are, but they are not with the Sreeman crowd. However, the Swarajist Leader knows that a good Congressman, though a brahmin, would be of much use for furthering the interests of the Congress; but he also knows that a bad Congressman, if only he is a nonbrahmin, is to him infinitely more precious as he alone can further his real objective underlying his proclaimed Swarajism, *viz*, the defeat of the Ministerialists. What would it matter to the Swarajist Leader if his Nonbrahmin followers are not able to achieve even a little bit in behalf of the Congress provided they are of use to him in his real urgency ?

That is why the Madras Swarajists have become deadened to all sense of honesty and decency. They are prepared to handle any material for rearing their phalanx. They will go to any lengths. They will face any contingency. They will bend low and touch the dust even. If so, what wonder that the Madras Swarajists have shaken hands with Government title-holders—those very men whom the Congress has constituted into a new Pariah sect ? The Madras Swarajists will flirt with men of decided moderate leanings-the very men whom the Congress has opined as utter imbeciles in the national struggle. They will court the help of men of honest sectarian beliefs—the very men who are regarded by the Congress as dangerous retrogrades.

Just now the Madras Swarajists, including their Leader, feel that so much of a concession even at the

ultimate sacrifice of the Congress fundamentals is needed for the rearing of their phalanxes. This feverish concern of theirs might be looked upon by some as madness. Even if it be madness, there is a method in it. What it is we will consider in the next article.

III

Modus-Sree Vaishnavendi.

The real objective of the Madras Swarajist Leader, viz, the re-establishment of the old Brahmin-lawyer-ascendency in South Indian politics—This Leader's principle of Modus-Sreevaishnavendi—The serious consequences arising out of Modus-Sreevaishnavendi-The deflection of true Congress Patriots like Dr. Varadarajulu—The Madras Swarajya Party's nonbrahmin colouring a mere make-believe.—The Madras Swarajya Party substantially a Sreevaishnavite Party. The Party's ulterior ambition.

In my previous article it was pointed out that under the clever manoeuvres of the Madras Swarajists the substantive interests of the Congress were being recklessly sacrificed with a dash and a spirit of bravado that must have been born of some sheer madness. But it was assured that even this madness had a method by which it was being worked out. That method is indeed highly ingenious; it is subtle; it has a gloss about it; it glitters; it tickles and lures us; it almost makes us swear by it. But all that glitters is not gold. And even so, this alluring method of the Madras Swarajists will not blind every one of us as completely as it has succeeded with most of us; but, however, with most of us it does succeed in its attempt at luring us to believe that the many irradiances it holds forth to our view are really the bright vistas surrounding the Pisgah of their political aspirations,

while as a matter of fact, those irradiances are the mirage-shades of an unscrupulous propaganda. That is why this mischief has to be checked at once, and every care has to be taken to see that the unsophisticated among us are not cheated and deceived by this cleverly-laid out plan of the Madras Swarajists. That our efforts in this behalf would succeed and thereby give us satisfaction we have to hope. And with that view it is here intended to analyse rather cautiously and intelligently the method behind the Swarajist madness. We will now address ourselves to this task.

This method can best be styled as Modus-Sree vaishnavendi. The very title is significant and in itself carries a mountain of explanation. But, however, there is no harm done by our elaborating its significance, by explaining at length its many implications, and because of them uttering words of caution in quite good time. Thus at the very outset without much ado we can state that Modus-Sreevaishnavendi is the basic principle on which in a broad perspective a very retrograde conservation is being ensured in South Indian politics. Those who handle this principle hope to establish once again in the political life of South India the brahmin-lawyer-ascendency that once held a supreme sway between 1908 and 1914. These vindicators of this Modus-Sreevaishnavendi have already formed themselves as the promoters of the brahmin lawyer-politician corporation. Perhaps they have even gone so far as to announce quite handsome dividends which in their confidence they have anticipated. As a corporation they will be forced to stand the rough-winds of public scrutiny and impartial criticism ; and, therefore, to make sure the stability of the corporation that is of their own making, the sponsors of Modus-Sreevaishnavendi have armed themselves with the benediction of the Congress which as a national

institution symbolising the impossible idealisms of the country does still call forth the chequered loyalty of vast masses of simple and guileless patriots. But more than that, they have started this big venture of theirs as the henchmen of the Congress and in behalf of the Congress interests. Consistent with such an attitude the Madras Swarajist Leader from very early set about to impart to the Congress organisation, as far as South India is concerned, a thick coating of Sreevaishnavisim ; and as months rolled by he went on adding coating after coating. This embellishment has vouchsafed to its executor a remarkable vantage point. What could this be ? What more need it be if this vantage-point means that the original non-communal implication of the Congress has given place to such a sectarian momentum as could be interpreted in the grandiloquent term of social democracy ? And in addition to this much, the Madras Swarajist Leader has succeeded in palming off on an unsuspecting public a sectarian imago as a well planned imbroglio of Swarajism. That is why the general public in S. India—we mean those who have not seen through the lines—seem to have grown enthusiastic over the political colcannon this Swarajist leader has offered to them in the name of the Congress ; but little do they suspect that its savouriness has cleverly sweetened the bitter pill of Sreevaishnavaite ambitions.

Hence what wonder if the public has not as yet discovered the Modus-Sreevaishnavendi of the Madras Swarajists ? The people believe that the Madras Swarajist Leader has no communal narrowness within himself. They believe his public activities are always in strict conformity with upright and unfaltering equity. And naturally they feel that he is genuinely concerned, without any motive, in helping those nonbrahmins who have pledged to stand by the Congress. To confirm such an opinion, they point

out that a large number of non-brahmin gentlemen have been put up by him as Congress candidates for the coming elections. But these persons do not as yet know that they have been gazing merely at the surface and that they have still to plunge deep within the Congress waters to know whither they have been intended to be carried on. Should not the question be raised, what kind of non-brahmin gentlemen have been adopted by this Swarajist Leader to represent the Congress at the elections? They are all like a pack of eels, plentiful of jelly-fish, but nothing with a back-bone. They are like invertebrates, automatons, nerveless hnman personations. There they stand for what they are worth. Their imbecility is their passport for favour in the eyes of this Swarajist Leader. He has wanted them, because he knows that with their innate contours, however awkwardly docile or puggily prostrate under his bidding, he could enact his puffery of communal equality and safety of nonbrahmin interests under the Congress aegis. Even they themselves know that they are only the pawns of this Swarajist Leader who is using them for a double-edged purpose, viz., to lend an impression that though a SreeVaishnavaite himself, he is really interested in the welfare of the right type of nonbrahmins, (viz, the Nationalist Congressmen) and at the same time really ensure the brahmin ascendency in South Indian politics.

Towards the consummation of such a fetid undertaking, the true nonbrahmin stalwarts of the Congress in in S. India have not given their assent. These stalwarts are absolutely virile in their outlook. Their integrity is so deeprooted and strong that they cannot become a new variety of jo-hukums dancing to the tune of Sreemanian patriotic professions. Without being invidious in the mention of names, we could single out that of Dr. Varadarajulu as of this

class. And now we should ask why it is that Dr. Varadarajulu has resigned from T. N. C. C. It cannot be that his interest in the Congress is now dead. We all know that to the end of his days and to the best of his abilities he would serve the Congress. He has gone out of the T. N. C. C., we presume, because he finds that mendacious politicians with a pack of tongue-tied and tail-bent followers have come to "manipulate" the interests of the Congress. Who knows, perhaps, he is quite sick of seeing just at present around the Congress organisation a wen-like growth of endless bickerings, low-souled vendettas, and personal preferments ? Because of this poky atmosphere enveloping the Congress personality in South India, Dr. Varadarajulu and others like him feel that it is better for them to get out of the "show" and leave the places of privileged leadership to the sponsors of Modus-Sreevaishnavendi. Of course, in alliance with these sponsors, there are a few nonbrahmin gentlemen whose personality must count any day. These are not only exiguous, but of their own free choice, they have come to coquet with the Swarajist Leader for achieving a political *coup*. (More about this in another article.) But once after achieving it they would part company from the Sreeman.

Thus it will be seen how the Modus-Sreevaishnavendi has been steered clear off men like Dr. Varadarajulu. And hence for its inaugurators, its triumph is assured ; and in all probability it would take them on to the El Dorado of their ambitions. In this way, when once the Madras Swarajist leaders have set foot on that land of promise, immediately they would safeguard themselves from exterior onslaughts on their dishonest and Jesuitical privileges by erecting their many fortalices of duplicity and adroit cunning. For such an end in view the Swarajist leaders have been preparing themselves with

foresight and introspection that must call forth our admiration, but for the fact they have been perverted in behalf of ignoble aspirations. At this juncture we wish to make bold to ask the Swarajist "leaders" whether their professions have not been suffused with inconsistencies and their conduct demoralised with questionable tactics. Because this is so, the Swarajist leaders, these sponsors of Modus-Sreevaishnavendi, have succeeded in driving out of the Congress executive men like Dr. Varadarajulu and pitch-forking in their place humpty, dumpty, nerveless, jackdaws. With the same tactics the Swarajist "leaders" have entered into secret alliances in the name of the Congress, when they have had no authority from the Congress to do so in its behalf. And by now we all know how the Swarajist Leader has elicited the support of the United Nationalists on the understanding that if they join his party and help to put him "in" and also themselves as Swarajists, he would undertake to have the Congress ban on office-acceptance removed, and thus would help them to fulfill the logical consequence of their (United Nationalists') programme.* The Swarajist Leader knows that to the United Nationalists non-acceptance of office would convey the very negation of their creed, and hence he has assured them that he would stand by them firmly on this very issue at the right moment. Only with the promise of such a reward the Swarajist Leader seems to have gathered round him the support of the United Nationalists.* Such a compromising promise the Swarajist Leader appears to have had to make. But we think that to this leader the making of such a promise would not have meant any great pain, because he too subconsciously at least, has been a believer in the efficacy of office-acceptance. And possibly he cannot forswear his own past ; and not very

* Read the appendix B.

long ago there was a time when he did cast his glances on the Ministerial Benches. Naturally in his private convictions he is one with the United Nationalists. He is also assured that with their help and co-operation the Swarajya Party men would be "returned" to the Council in sufficient numbers. By then he would have made the Congress lift the ban on office-acceptance. Then the Swarajya Party would have to form the Ministry. And the Swarajya Party being himself and just a few other compeers at his side, he would be the minister-maker, the minister, and the ministry itself.† He then would 'lead' the Council. He would be the national half in the bureaucratic dyarchy. He would remember his brahminism. He would recollect his eminence as a lawyer. He would open his eyes to the need of the moment and know that he should establish an ascendency. He and his compeers would re-establish the brahmin-lawyer-politician-predominance. Of course care would be taken that this predominance remains faithfully and on the whole Sreevaishnavaite. Then indeed his compeers would shout, Modus--Sreevaishnavendi has triumphed.

No doubt that for a political aspirant on that day no manna would fall from the heavens. But this will not prevent the Madras Swarajist leaders from carrying on this particular work of theirs. In it they will persist—come what may! In their persistent toil, the Swarajists will not scruple to perpetrate many pogroms of true national interests and constitutional proprieties. There is absolutely no doubt that the Swarajists would enact such pogroms. But since they would mean an utter disaster to our country's best cause, all of us, the sincere

† Though it is given out in the press that Mr. Sreenivasa Iengar is contesting the Madras City seat for the Assembly, I learn from very reliable sources that just at the nick of time Mr. Iengar would begin to contest a seat in the Madras Council.

lovers of the country and of the Congress, must prevent their enactment. To prevent them, we should know what shape or course they are likely to assume, if already they have not. This we will consider in the next article.

———

IV

Swarajist Pogroms.

Constitutional proprieties being mercilessly stampeded-Three aspects of public life (1) Rights of representation, (2) Definition and demarcation of 'legislative' and 'Civic' programmes of work. (3) allegiance to mandates, to be zealously guarded.—The negation by the Swarajists of all the above three principles.

Towards the end of my last article it was hinted by me that the Madras Swarajist leaders, in their anxiety to assure themselves about the triumph of Modus-Sree Vaishnavendi, had undertaken many pogroms of well-established constitutional principles. And here it will be pointed out how those constitutional proprieties, which we all should respect in our endeavour to build up responsible, democratic, government, are being mercilessly stampeded through irresponsible and doctrinaire poses of personal hauteur and the plutocrats' *izats*. This must be prevented at all costs ; and we should resist such retrogression which seems to be outlandishly unfamiliar to all canons of representative government. We should do so because then alone our "popular" government, in whatever stage of manifestation, could be conducted not in obedience to plutocrats' dictates and manipulations but to those of free conscience, veracity, and commonsense. Moreover, in our encouraging such pogroms, as of the Madras Swarajists, there is this danger, that all of them do breed the germ of political corruption which has the

capacity of multiplying itself with remarkable speed. Therefore if we to-day do not sternly challenge the Swarajist Mohocks in our midst, then at some later day we would all be the victims of a demoralising tradition in our body politic. Perhaps then the very principle of self-government would be distorted into a veritable devilment of the money-bags. Indeed, the dismal state of such a day we could hardly now imagine. And hence it is in the interests of healthy public life that at the very outset now we do check the free-play of subversive tendencies and unhealthy conventions. With this object a few aspects of the Swarajist pogroms will be here indicated. And I earnestly request my readers to deeply ponder over the implications lurking behind them.

Now I will set forth for their careful consideration the following three aspects of our public life :—Rights of representation, definition and demarcation of "legislative" and "civic" programmes of work, and allegiance to mandates. Touching the first of these we find that the Madras Swarajists have been entertaining an opinion which appears indefensible from the standpoint of propriety or commonsense. They seem not to have envisaged correctly the fundamental idea in a person representing a constituency. They seem to grant that it is perfectly legitimate for anyone living in Ganjam to represent Tinnevelly constituency or for one in Madras to represent a constituency in Malabar or the Ceded Districts. That is why the Swarajya Party has nominated Mr. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar for the Tanjore-Trichinopoly constituency and Mr. Prakasam for that of Godavari. Both of these gentlemen are "permanent" residents of Madras where they have taken root. They have little of an autonomous tie binding them to the constituencies they have chosen. Of course, on their side they might plead that they are in

physical "contact" with their constituencies. But that is not any justification of their curious standpoint. It matters little whether either Mr. Prakasam or Mr. Iyengar could be seen going fifty times a year to Godavari or Trichinopoly ; and, on the other hand, what ought to be of paramount consideration is whether they have "taken root" within the territorial limits of their constituencies. One has to respect considerations like local knowledge, intimate affinity, and approximation to the environment. These have to be respected because in our country just at this juncture "work" in the legislatures means the capacity to know the urgent needs of a locality, to know how the immediate public opinion is being focussed on them, and to be its vindicators and interpreters. For adequately discharging such a burden, the man on the spot is decidedly better qualified than one who happens to be only a recurring visitant. And now from such a standpoint, the qualification of both Mr. Iyengar and Mr. Prakasam for representing the constituencies they have chosen is open to much grave defect. For if they are 'returned' in reality they would be representing in the Assembly not the consensus of public opinion, from time to time, of the constituencies but of their own view-point. Naturally "our masters" would be relegated to the waste-heap of withering negation. Of course the whole issue is changed in the case of 'Special constituencies'—those like the University and the Chamber of Commerce. In passing, we may remark that we have heard that the public of Godavari and Trichinopoly do not in the least like that these two gentlemen, whose substantial business and professional interests pin them to Madras, should be forced on them as their representatives, while there are many among themselves who could well play that role. But thanks to the numerous artful devices of the Madras Swarajya Party, such voices of legitimate

protest have been drowned by the scapegrace whacking of mendacious declamations. But in spite of it all, this extra unconstitutionalism, so to say, of the Madras Swarajya Party cannot completely be explained away. That is why we are quite aware that the Madras Swarajists have been trifling with the Chepauk division for the coming Corporation elections. We know that the voters of Chepauk do not desire that a person not residing within that jurisdiction should enjoy the privilege and advantage of representing them. But yet the Swarajist Leader has thought it judicious to force Mr. O. K. Chetty on their attention. Such a move must be condemned as being absolutely improper. There can be no convincing argument justifying it. If in his anxiety to oust Dr. Natesa Mudaliar, the Swarajist Leader were to catch hold of some weather-beaten hero from Timbuctu, what should one opine about the resources of the Swarajya Party? To the Swarajists themselves it must be painfully clear that their party is in paucity of men residing in the Chepauk division itself who could be expected to contest the election with this opponent of theirs. And is it not deplorable indeed that the best disciplined party should have come to such a pass? O! how low the mighty have fallen!

Even such a plight seems not to have brought any unction to the political mind of the Madras Swarajist Leader. He is an irrepressible optimist seeing always the credit side of his party's achievements. But there is such a fact as prudence being the better part of valour. And hence if this Swarajist Leader is keen on not rendering himself the butt of jubilant ridicule, he would desist from championing the cause of these 'extra-territorial' candidates. If he does not, his intransigeances will adequately be rewarded. Anyway we hope that this Swarajist leader will not envelop himself in the fog of a self-opinionated

discretion—one that is unbalanced, injudicious, and prone to be cowardly. Let him not, however, mistake this caution as a piece of unsolicited advice.

The same caution need not be lost on the other Swarajists. These are certainly in need of sobriety and sense of proportion. Of these two perquisites, our Swarajists lack utterly the latter. That is why they have been raising themselves on public platforms with a gusto of unmeaning abstractions. They seem not to have the wherewithal with which to deliver the message they have undertaken in behalf of the Congress. Otherwise why is it that in their election-propaganda meetings the Swarajist spokesmen have had only two slogans to repeat—Down with the Justice-ites as they are anti-Congress and up with them as they are for the Congress? Of course, there is nothing wrong in their repeating these slogans, since perhaps every political party has to employ the trick of slogan-repetitions. But if merely hazy, misty, vague, generalised opinions are blurted forth without uttering any statements of facts or grounds for conviction, it means that the programme you advocate has no rationale behind it. Consequently if without reasonable arguments in behalf of your contentions you go and try to palm them off on others with the help of irrelevant assertions, you would be put down for one who bluffs and only bluffs. And if this be so, who can deny that our Madras Swarajists have been the most pronounced bluffers we have met with during the recent months? No doubt their bluffs are enclosed in an artistry of savoury invectives and adjectival inelegances, and are uttered in siren-like tunes; but nonetheless they are bluffs. Let us illustrate :—Of late the Madras Swarajists have been addressing election-meetings in behalf of the Council and Assembly elections. The programme of

theirs on whose behalf they stand to plead must have some tangibility and some concreteness about it. But it has no shape, and its only shapeliness is that it very lavishly invokes the name of Mahatma Gandhi. Besides, in both the Corporation-election and the Council-election propaganda, the Swarajists repeat parrot-like the same old assertions and accusations. True this is all quite 'nice' by way of a clever *cliche* to say, "We must win Swaraj . . . We are under a foreign bureaucracy that has crushed the soul of the nation . . . The bureaucracy must go. . . We must fight for freedom . . . Mother India has fallen low from her high estate. . .The Congress alone can lead us to Swaraj. . . Swaraj is our birth-right. We stand by Mahatmaji . . We are for many unities . . Help us and Swaraj will be ours. . . Mahatma Gandhi-ki-jai. . ." But how often repeat the same? What bearing would assertions like the above ones have with reference to a programme that ought to outline the proposed reforms touching the needs of the particular ward in the city or of the particular constituency? What could the mention of stricken Mother India help in elucidating a plan of civic legislation by which the civic needs of any ward are promised to be bettered? Such prattling of minced superoctaves has to be discouraged. And we trust the Madras electorate will be on its guard whenever the Swarajists under the bidding of their two suffetes place before them with many coquettish gestures mere suds of their devotion to the Congress and of their earnest for Swaraj. For what we should be particular about is that our Corporation ought not to become the arena of mere drumbeaters; and hence we trust our voters will be very careful in promising their suffrage to the Swarajist candidates, because their chatter at election-meetings shows a profound lack of constructive insight into our urgent civic needs. Even at the cost of repetition, we

would not mind once again stating that the profuse professions of the Swarajist candidates ought not to blind us to their unvarnished reality, and we must fully realise that almost all of the Swarajist candidates now appearing on the scene are immature, inexperienced, amateurish, political dilettantes busy at chimeras and ugly self-aggrandisements. The more they talk in the public without distinction of constructive programmes they can place before the electorate the more pronounced ought to be our opinion about them as mere tall-talkers capable, at best, of political and civic bouleversement. So, once more we urge the electorate not to be carried away by the Swarajist airy-nothings, and that the more they hear of these, better for them to remember Hamlet saying, "Methinks the lady protests too much."

Particularly there is one danger from which the electorate must guard itself. This danger has not been discerned yet. It is still under a cloak that nobody has suspected till now. Nevertheless, all its implications—at least in their broad outlines—could unambiguously be conveyed. So let us now consider these implications. We find that the Congress candidates have been talking about the electorates, the Congress, and of themselves. And between these three factors a peculiar relationship is being established—a relationship which while critically examined would betray a most unconstitutional theory. According to this, the Congress candidate accepts as his constitutional master both the Congress and the electorate. He admits that he is a servant of the Congress, who is bound to respect the dictates of the Congress, and who is prepared to abide by them. Then again he admits with equal acknowledgment that the electorate is his master before whom he has come to seek its favour on the basis of the soundness of his commitments which

owe their origin to the dictates of the Congress. If thus, the Congress candidate admits two 'masters', are we to understand that in his opinion both of them are of the same status or that he differentiates them as one being the 'immediate' and the other the 'ultimate'? Of course, in the eye of the law the Congress has no inherent constitutional status in the machinery of the State. This must be clear and open to no reservations; and as such all talk of the Congress being like the Mother-Parliament must be mere tosh. That is why virtually till the time of the elections the Congress candidate does admit that the electorate is the ultimate master for him. He also goes so far as to concede that the will of the electorate is the supreme sanction, and that his personal judgment on all vital issues must bow down to it. Such a fair interpretation of the constitutional juxta-position is kept in mind by the Congress candidate only up to the election-week. After that he is ready to flout the 'supreme sanction of the ultimate master'. This he would do so because from the very beginning he has been concerned with superimposing the authority of the Congress on that of the electorate. That is why the Congress candidates would be 'returned' on some definite programme presented by them to the electorate ; after the elections if the Congress were to bid them change their programme they would do so and with this revised programme they would continue to work in the legislatures as the representatives of the electorate. But before they begin pursuing such an altered programme would they go to the electorate and obtain its approval of it and its sanction in its behalf ? Certainly not. Once the elections over, they would not trouble themselves about the electorates. They would 'clean' forget them. Though sitting in the Councils as their representatives they would shift and change as the Congress

might bid them do. Then they would invoke the authority of the Congress but not of the electorate. The Congress mandate alone would be for them their ultimate constitutional sanction. Such a supererogation through the Congress mandate has certainly no constitutional status in the legal jurisdiction of the State. It would be a dangerous subversion of the very basis of representative Government. It would be dangerous because under it there is every risk of the conclusions of a party of particular political persuasion being put into legislation without obtaining the 'opinion' of the electorates on the issues concerned. The will of any political party, however national, ought not to be allowed to dominate over that of the electorate.

This danger just at present is imminent. We find that the Congress candidates have been pleading before the voters that they wish to enter the Councils for not accepting office there because the Congress has decreed so. In case the Congress candidates are "returned," which means that the electorate endorses the non-acceptance-of-office item of the Congress programme, on this non-acceptance ticket, what would they do if after the elections the Congress were to commend to them office-acceptance? Would they then resign their seats, seek re-election on the basis of the new Congress mandate of office-acceptance, wait for its verdict, and act according to that verdict of the electorate ? No, not in the least. The Congress candidates would now get into the Councils, stick on there right till the end of the term, and all the while go on 'changing' the items in the election ticket they had presented to the electorate at the time of the elections, because the Congress bids them so change. Thus after getting into the Councils, the Congress candidates would respect not the sanction of the electorate,

which is the only proper and constitutional authority to be respected, but of the Congress. Perhaps they would not mind the absurdity of suggesting as their defence that the Congress is *sine qua non* with the electorate and as such the mandatory rulings of the Congress, *ipso facto*, are those of the electorate. But need we say that to imply that the Congress is quite the same as the electorate is to enact a most shocking constitutional fiction? For at best the Congress is only a patriotic, national, political organisation ; but it can hardly be either the electorate or even as good as the electorate. We trust that this position is quite unmistakable. And we hope that the electorate would bear it in mind. We would here once more urge that the electorate should guard its integrity and status and that it must not allow its privileges to be constantly trifled with by the frequent aberrations of a political organisation possessing ingenious and subtle brains. It must not mind the traditional halo of the Congress. For then alone would to us be ensured the free-play of representative Government, which we are now enjoying even though it be in its embryonic state.

And now at the end I trust my readers would bear in mind the three constitutional pogroms that are being enacted by the Congress-Swarajists. This knowledge will help them to keep them away from the Swarajist net spread before them. If they would wish not to be tempted at all by the professions of the Swarajists at this election time they must recapitulate, in particular, the entire happenings about the non-acceptance of office episode. We will, therefore, consider this in the next article.

V

The Swarajist Stunt-Non-acceptance of Office

The Wrecking programme—Discriminatory obstruction—Exigencies of the hour—Hindu and Muslim views—Two birds with one stone—Swarajists' unseemly wire-pulling and machinations—outlook of the United Nationalists—Everywhere an ugly electioneering stunt—Sailing under false colours.

In the last article we had undertaken to examine at length the Swarajist intransigeance of non-acceptance of office, because it had been pointed out that this particular item in their election-ticket was being converted into an Aladdin lamp capable of promising them, with the help, of course, of the most lurid trickery, some of their most cherished ambitions. In fact, this non-acceptance of office cry of theirs is the most striking stunt that the Swarajists intend playing upon the electorate just at this juncture. Perhaps it may be that most of us, unless we happen to be absolutely on our guard, would be tricked by it into believing the *bona fides* beneath this pledge. And on this pledge "Camouflage" is writ large. Moreover, even in the hands of its eloquent champions, this pledge of "non-acceptance" betrays a plentiful idea of uneasiness which has about it a very fishy air. In fact, in this particular Swarajist profession we have come to smell a rat. Therefore the more we are on our guard the better would it be for us. And I trust that every decent, honest man wishes not to be played low down on. For

this purpose I now propose to place before my readers some of the important and salient considerations we have to weigh with reference to this Swarajist creed of "non-acceptance".

It is not, of course, very necessary to go into a detailed narration of this Swarajist creed. We know that non-acceptance was one of the fundamental corollaries of the creed of wrecking inaugurated by the late Desabandhu Das. That creed of "Wrecking" had a sway over us as long as the political commonsense and sense of proportion in the country had been completely paralysed for over a pretty long time; and as long as it held sway "non-acceptance" had in the nature of things a vitality about it. Then indeed "non-acceptance" had a tangible connotation and somewhat of a spaciousness too, although some of us had the courage to curse it as the demon of excrescence let loose on our body politic. But, however, in course of time, this demon was exorcized. How and by whom it is not necessary for us just now to consider. Enough to know that to-day the wrecking programme has been given the "let-go". Its impractical idealism has been relegated to that background whereon political will-o-wisps thrive, but thrive to no one useful purpose. Besides, it has been sobered down in a graceful manner so that the present pass to which it has been brought does not surely outrage the memory of that great man whose mistaken zeal alone must have prompted its inauguration. If so, what is its present position? It is this, that the original creed of complete, continuous, consistent obstruction has given place to discriminatory obstruction.

This discriminatory obstruction was formulated in the Delhi A. I. C. C. resolution of March 1926. An

examination of its items points out this patent fact, that the Swarajists have now come to concede that in the legislatures they could push through their constructive programme. Not only could they use the legislatures for carrying out their reformatory measures but might even go to the extent of "co-operating" with the legislatures by way of serving on Select-Committees and by way of accepting Presidentships. But nevertheless the Swarajists have been declaring that they would not accept offices, especially Ministerships, and that they were most pointedly against office—acceptance. These Swarajists must be quite aware of the absurd position into which they have launched themselves. It is, thus, merely unthinkable how any party in an elective legislature could push through constructive programmes by being in the opposition, which happens when you do not accept "responsibility" and "office". (This absurdity was fully exposed by me in my last pamphlet, entitled "The Case for Responsive Co-operation.") This absurdity was enough to disgust the sober section of the Swarajists, whose sense of perspective happened now to be fully awake. These Swarajists did point out that when once complete, consistent, continuous, obstruction is given up, discriminatory obstruction in its place is installed, to serve on Select Committees and as Presidents is accepted, and the legislatures are begun to be made use of for reformatory legislation, you as a party of majority—if you happen to have it—will have to accept 'responsibility' and take up 'office.' This position, even in a hypothetical frame, was urged upon by Mr. Jayakar before the Swarajya Party for its acceptance. But the Swarajya Party—especially its camp-followers, tomahawkers, penny-whistlers, doggerels, and hangers-on,—rejected with an ugly pose of contempt the Jayakar-plea.. Thereafter Mr. Jayakar seceded from

the Swarajya Party, and with his fine chivalry, sobriety of outlook, clean politics, and a persuasive personality, all rounded off with an innate culture, formed the Responsivists' Party. It took root, and has been thriving. When thus it had been made clear that the Jayakar-plea, viz., office-acceptance by the Swarajists, had touchingly appealed to the political commensense of the country, the great Moghul of the Swarajya Party felt that it was in his interests to come to a diplomatic alliance with his erstwhile comrade and now the stand-bearer of a chaste and very powerful revolt. Therefore, Pundit Motilalji arranged for the Sabarmati meeting. In that meeting at Sabarmati, a Swarajist leader emerged as a nightmare and with his speckled band broke the meeting and forced Punditji not to sober himself with counsels from the Responsivists. Necessarily the Sabarmati-pact was buried deep. And on that waste-heap the Swarajists headed by Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar reinstated their banner of non-acceptance. Before reinstating it, the ritual of a subtly dishonest intrigue must have been gone through.*

During that ritual the Swarajists seem to have agreed among themselves that their professed plea in behalf of 'non-acceptance' should be only by way of a ruse and an electioneering stunt useful till the elections are over and negligible and neglectable after the elections. This should have been done with a view that they might invoke the sympathy of the No-changers and through them that of the electorates for their success at the coming elections. And, indeed, very cleverly these Swarajists discerned that they could win the affections of the No-changers only by appearing before them as the most modernised version of the ancient 'wrecker' and not by any means as

*Read the Appendix B (1)

a species of the other tradition-old political groups in the country. With this appearance they wished, and do wish, to gain currency. For what end? The answer would not be uttered by the Swarajists now in any plain words. Therefore they say that they wish to enter the Councils but not accept office so that dyarchy could be rendered impossible. This is the professed pleading of theirs. But, at the same time, these Swarajists do know that they have to be alive to the paramount exigencies of the hour. For this purpose, the Swarajists have had to so manipulate their stunt of 'non-acceptance,' as to make it beat in unison with the exigencies of the present hour.

Therefore, it is necessary that we should now examine a little more about what we have called the exigencies of the hour. We know that between the death of the late Desabandhu Das and the appointment of Mr. Tambe, the Swarajya Party was slowly being rent assunder by internal dissensions. On the Tambe appointment, frank and sincere personal opinions, bearing implications on the needs of the hour, were uttered with a courage that must evoke our warmest admiration. These first voices of a reawakened political consciousness came to be sounded through Mr. Jayakar and Mr. Kelkar. In answer came the great god's angry retort of "amputating the diseased limb'. But, however, the amputation was beyond his powers, and the diseased limb betrayed a deeper canker elsewhere but very near his own interests. Then slowly and steadily the Maharashtrean cessation took root. And after Akola it prospered, because it was fed by the waters of honesty. political integrity, and a lively sense of the country's own limitations. At this juncture, the best brains in the country felt that India's interests at this stage could not be ensured through intransigeances like 'wrecking' and 'non-acceptance'. Many felt that the

Councils must be worked for what they are worth. Such an aspect of the situation was accepted by both the Hindus and the Mussalmans. The protagonists of both the communities proclaimed that they ought to safeguard the interests of their respective communities in the Councils. And to them safeguarding a community's interests in a legislature was not through the Swarajist stunts of 'wrecking' and 'non-acceptance'. So Pundit Malaviyaji and Sir Abdur Rahim in right earnest began to prepare for the Council-elections. The Hindu-Mahasabha and the Muslim League were whipped to this endeavour. The whole people, according to their communal equation, began to support either the Hindu-Mahasabha or the Muslim League. They continue to do so. For in popular estimation, and in a most telling reckoning, the Hindu-Mahasabha and the Muslim-League have come to occupy a position of pre-eminence. As against these two organisations the Congress has been standing as a spectre of a by-gone prosperity. Our Swarajists have very carefully noted this fact. They know that the Hindus at large would favour the Hindu Mahasabha even to the complete exclusion of the Congress itself. Also they know for what the Hindu-Mahasabha has been pleading. They could not mistake it, especially after what Raja Rajendranath opined in his Presidential Address on the 13th of March last. This is what he said:—

"The position with which I am now directly concerned is that those who aim at higher principle and profess them may find it impossible to give them practical shape, owing to circumstances which are not of their creation. Temporary secession or following back may be necessitated by circumstances beyond their control. We aim at nationalisation, but assume for the present a communal attitude because that attitude has been forced upon

us by circumstances. One of the objects of the Mahasabha is to promote good feelings between the Hindus and the other communities in India and to act in a friendly way with them with a view to evolve a united and self-governing Indian nation. We are prepared to throw up the lower for the higher ideal, the moment the necessity for it ceases. I do not wish to describe at length the circumstances which have forced communalism upon us, and I do not wish to assign proportions to the various contributory causes. I take notice of the fact that communalism exists, that discrimination between caste and creed for the acquisition of civic rights, which is a general way of describing communalism, is enforced in every part of Hindustan, that in most places it prejudicially affects the civic rights of the Hindus, whilst in some places and in certain spheres it divides them hopelessly. The united voice of 230 millions of Hindus should be raised, against this discriminative policy, which, however, is only one of the reasons why the Mahasabha has come into existence. . . . To sum up, the *raison d'etre* of the Hindu organisation is that Hindu interests are nowhere adequately protected, that for the protection of them the united voice of 230 millions should be raised, that Hindu community lacks solidarity and union which must be brought about and that its attitude towards certain low classes is its own creation and a change in that attitude is necessary for which the Hindu community more than any other should specially exert. The Mahasabha is as much an advocate of free and democratic institutions for the country and as eager to obtain Swaraj as any other body. But it notices with regret that so far constitutions have been suggested and framed without due regard to Hindu interests. We are told that political and civic interest of Hindus and Mahomedans are the same. It should be so, but it is not so in fact, owing to

defects in the constitution. Mahomedan interests are being treated as a separate class by itself, and this has forced upon us the consideration of the Hindu interests as a separate class. We cannot refrain from devoting serious thought to the considerations of those interests simply out of a fear that such a course will give rise to a controversy and may delay our achievement of the goal of Swaraj."

As against such Hindu pleading and Mussalman counter-cry, the Swarajist pleading for a stand of negation through non-acceptance was lost in the wilderness of Swarajist mutual-admiration. Consequently the Swarajists came to feel that the response in the country for their programme was getting weaker and weaker. But it was in their interests somehow once again to enlist the popular sympathies in their favour. This had to be done with much subtlety. For one thing the Swarajists had proclaimed that they were seeking the suffrage of the electorate on the 'non-acceptance' ticket. This item they could not unceremoniously drop, and at least for the sake of prestige they had to stick to it for a decent while. But if they did earnestly stick to it the chances ot their being 'returned' would become painfully few indeed. They would not certainly like to see the places which could be theirs being usurped by the Hindu-Mahasabhaiets or Muslim Leaguers. So the Swarajists had to ensure popular sympathies by hinting that in the Councils they would drop out negations and would embark on legislative measures coloured richly with communalist interest, and at the same time for the sake of prestige, they had to gestaculate over the non-acceptance item. Such a move could be undertaken only with great duplicity. But luckily the Swarajist leaders were neither nervous nor incapable of handling

subterfuges for such a connivance. Therefore some of the ingenious among them came to put a new construction on the Delhi A. I. C. C. resolution. From this new construction it emerged that the Congress for the present—meaning till the elections are over—was opposed to office-acceptance, but that from this it must not follow that the Congress would always be opposed to office-acceptance. When this view is pushed to its logical conclusion one can read through it. Only with such an interpretation the Swarajists wish to coquet with both the sections—those who want Congress candidates not to accept office and those who want them to accept. If you are of the former the Swarajists can satisfy you by telling that in obedience to the Congress mandate they would not accept office ; but if you are of the latter section, then with equal bravado the Swarajists can satisfy you by pointing out that there is nothing in the Congress-mandate on 'non-acceptance' to suggest that the Congress would not, and could not, be able to shift its view on the issue, and that as such they can, might, and would, accept office. Common to both attitudes is the Swarajist' one desire of getting returned to the Councils without being ousted by others.

In this way the Swarajists wish to hit two birds with one stone. What an admirable insight have these Swarajists into the exigencies of the hour ! And what a statecraft of dissembling tactics the Swarajists have succeeded in rearing ! And for all this what a high priest they have in the now acting leader of the Swarajya Party ! Indeed the gods have been kind in gifting the Swarajists with a person who can very, very cleverly explain away many inconvenient commitments. To a charge levelled against him by a prominent Congress enthusiast that he, though a Swarajist, had thought it fit to promise people that he

would see the Congress lifts its ban on office-acceptance, and that with such promises he was strengthening his own position, Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar can explain away the charges in what has come to be called "a somewhat intriguing statement". In reply to what Mr. Iyengar conveyed in his statements of July 2nd and July 9th, 1926, Mr. Narasimha Raju openly threw the "glove" at Mr. Iyengar in his statement (12th of July, 1926,) which runs as follows. " . , . Mr. Iyengar has referred to the earlier conversations. Let me remind him that they were terminated with the exhibition of bad temper on either side at a party meeting held in the Mahajana Sabha Hall previous to December 1925, and that he invited me for further conversation in February last and that in response to this written invitation I had to visit him again. I have received one or two letters about this time from Mr. Muthiah Mudaliar describing the attitude of Mr. Iyengar and his friends regarding the removal of ban on office. Whatever the denials of Mr. Iyengar may be at present a publication of these letters which I shall be able to do soon after I return to Vizag may enable the public to understand the views of Mr. Iyengar and his friends regarding the removal of ban on office. . . Regarding the conversation at Sabarmati I am glad that two or three Andhras including Mr. Govindachari, the Editor of "Satyagrahi" who started the controversy, were present, when Mr. Iyengar said "Put me in power, etc.," which statement he now denies. This is astonishing to me."*

From such denialsand counter-denials does it not follow that this entire affair is fishy? Either Mr. Narasimha Raju or Mr. Iyengar must have gone about carrying on an unseemly wire-pulling. In this connection we trust Mr. Narasimha Raju as a gentleman would either

*Read the Appendix B (2).

publish the letters referred to by him or openly acknowledge that at no time had Mr. Iyengar promised him his exertions to have the Congress ban on office-acceptance removed. In this behalf Mr. Raju owes a duty to the public, and even though he has once again rejoined the Swarajya Party, he must not burk performing it.

This episode apart, there are other circumstances suggesting that the Swarajist leaders have been secretly preparing the Congress to accede to office-acceptance. In Madras before the walk-out, and since then, the Swarajists have allied themselves with the United Nationalists. And it is not too much to say that the Madras Swarajists have the semblance of a strongly organised political group when they are seen in alliance with the United Nationalists. These United Nationalists, who by temperament and conviction are incapable of wrecking and non-acceptance negations, have been brought into close contact with the Swarajists. Would they have come to ally with the Swarajists even at the sacrifice of their political convictions and most cherished of political ambitions ? Certainly not. These United Nationalists must have been assured by the Swarajists that after the elections they would not be prevented by them from accepting office, and for their part the United Nationalists must have agreed to profess for the time being—that is till the elections are over—a creed of non-acceptance so that with it they might more easily "get in" at the elections. Some such "understanding" must have been arrived at. A few months later what it is will be made clear. In this connection I make bold to make this assertion that in Madras, if the Swarajists-cum-United Nationalists are "returned," the entire Swarajya Party, including its newest recruits, would accept office, in case they possess a dependable

majority ; if not, the old Swarajists in the Swarajya Party would remain only as a few in number who would not accept office, and a large number from the Swarajya Party would re-appear as the United Nationalists and would accept office ; and that, thus, the orthodox Swarajists in the Madras Council would be just a mocking few. If there is anyone who would dare to challenge this forecast, I would very much like to read his views. In particular I request the Madras Swarajist Leader to speak out his mind on what I have stated. It won't do for him not to answer me on the score that what I write in the columns of the *Justice* could be passed over in contempt. That would not be playing the game fairly. As a responsible leader he owes it to the public to speak out his mind in this connection. I have here alluded to this because to a certain letter of mine wherein I had requested him to state as the Leader of the Swarajya Party whether those Swarajist candidates who might be 'returned' on the 'non-acceptance' ticket would resign their seats and seek re-election in case the Congress after the elections were to lift its ban on office-acceptance and make office-acceptance one of the items in its programme, he had not the bare courtesy to reply. Personally Mr. Iyengar might consider me a worm beneath his notice. It does not hurt me. But I write with the privilege of a publicist and as a member of a responsible political party ; and only in this capacity do I request him to kindly answer the contentions I raise. If in spite of this enlightenment he refuses to extend to me the courtesy of a reply, I know by what name to call him.

This parenthesis apart, and coming to the point on hand, we fully know that to the United Nationalists the prestige of the Congress or the interests of the Congress

ideals cannot mean the same consequential import as the problem of how to replace the Panagal Ministry. That is why Mr. Narasimha Raju's walk-out statement was not so much a denunciation of the bureaucracy from the standpoint of the Congress as that of the United Nationalists' catalogue of grievances against the present Madras Ministry. When such is the fundamental outlook of the United Nationalists, their alliance with the Swarajists must indicate just the juxtaposition that was referred to above.

Turning to Bengal, there too one finds that the Swarajya Party is shifting its moorings. Strife of tongues and babel of voices cannot screen from the public the Swarajists' newest envisagement. That is also towards office-acceptance, of course under certain conditions. With all their reservations and provisos, the Bengal Swarajists are as further removed from 'wrecking' and unconditional non-acceptance as their comrades in Madras or even in Bombay. Such an implication is justified by the disclosures recently made in the *Bengalee.** In Bombay, too, where the Responsivists are decidedly stronger than the Swarajists, public opinion seems to have begun to read into the Bombay Swarajists' manipulations just those implications we detailed above. A responsible Bombay journal in its editorial columns comments thus on the Swarajist position : "The sudden and unexpected resignation of the Pundit in favour of the ex-Advocate-General of Madras, though advertised as a temporary measure, gives sufficient scope for the suspicion that it is really an abdication in favour of Mr. Iyengar who as the world knows is a confirmed Responsivist, his incredulous statements and explanations notwithstanding. The whole sublimity of national poli-

*Read the Appendix A

tics has simply been degraded into ugly personal grabbing and it is this that is responsible for the general apathy of the people about the political movement we witness everywhere. No leader is free from this charge. Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, the ex-Advocate-General from Madras wants "to be placed into the Presidential Chair of the Assam Congress." He must therefore pose as a great orthodox Swarajist putting up bluffs about civil disobedience and direct action. . . So the public must be made to believe that the Sabarmati Pact was a serious mishap. . . We would therefore simply give them the most irrefutable authority in support of what we have stated. No less a person than Mrs. Sarojini Naidu put it very bluntly and plainly in the face of Mr. Jamnadas Mheta at the last meeting of the A. I. C. C. at Ahmedabad that the whole row kicked up on the Sabarmati Pact was an ugly electioneering stunt. . . . ." After reading this what should we infer? Can we not say that in Bombay too the cat is being let out of the bag?

In the light of what has been stated so far, would it be too much to suggest that the Swarajist chatter now of 'non-acceptance' is only a main item in the Swarajist Isidonian Decretals? Should we be deceived by them? No, not in the least. If so let us carefully bear in mind that in the name of the Congress and that great peerless man Mahatma Gandhi, and with the garb of impersonal patriotism and altruistic solicitude, the Swarajists have been trying to entrench themselves in places of power, privilege and profit, but without any frankness of admission accompanying that task. Should we therefore choose such men in preference to the less sophisticated Moderates and the Justiceites who have the courage and honesty to tell plainly that they wish to enter the Councils in order that there they might serve the country in such

a way that while that task may be incidentally benefitting them it would not be an outrage on sober nationalism and decent opposition ? Should we prefer men who would honestly acknowledge what is a fact, that they have some stature, though not as yet their fullest, in the amplitude of our legislatures, or those who unreservedly cry down our legislatures as "Councils of Maya," proclaim that they would crush them to indistinguishable waste-heap, but yet sulkily creep in there under false colours, bore holes and in them treasure up their well-being ? Our attitude in such matters must be unequivocal and uncompromising. And need I say that it behoves us to keep ourselves away from the Swarajist machinations and put our trust in the hands of the Responsivists, the Indian Nationalists, and the Justiceites ? If we do so we would be doing unto ourselves a good turn, for when all is said and done it is certain that as compared with the politicians of the non-Swarajist predilections most of the Swarajist politicians on the scene now are somewhat like pigmies by way of being mature statesmen and wise legislators. Most of the Swarajists have the only distinction of being fire-eaters and impractical iconoclasts. Of course the Swarajists have in their ranks eminent legislators like Mr. Jamnadas Mheta. I say, hats off to Mr. Mheta. But does one swallow make a summer ?. We have, therefore, to be careful in gauging the capabilities of the Swarajists. In order to correctly earmak the practical statesmanship and legislative acumen of the Swarajist rank and file, we will examine briefly in the next article some of their accomplishments.

VI

The Swarajist Water-Level

*The Swarajist bubble—A Congressman's confession—Look at the Madras and Ahmedabad Corporations—Expose the Swarajists' solicitude in behalf of Labour—*A *warning against the present Congress.*

In this article I wish just to touch upon a few salient aspects of the arguments that the Swarajists of late have been adducing in their favour. Especially when we read through the press reports about the Swarajist election campaign in the city the feeling comes on us that the entire Swarajist stock-in-trade is made up of cheap truisms, effete generalisations, mock-heroic *ipsi dixits*, and theatrical declamations. With this melee of inconsequential rotundates the Swarajists endeavour to evoke the sympathies and the confidence of the electorate. If, then, they have been successful it follows that either the electorate is uncritical about them or that it too complacently acquiesces in the pandemonian likerish chatter of diminutive Davids, reputation-battered martyrs, wirepullers, opportunist poachers, and other minor gods. But we know that the electorate has not as yet come on its dotage and that its heart is sound. The only trouble with it seems to be that more often than not it is apt to be uncritical. Anyway we do hope that, as days go by and the "hour of polling" is approached, it would bestir itself, think calmly, judge dispassionately, and view the rather complex phenomena before its eyes in a correct perspective, with caution aud discrimination. This task is like a sacred duty it must undertake. And as a help in its

behalf we will here place befo e i a few observations for its consideration.

To begin with, we can opine that most of the Madras Swarajist speakers talk a good deal that conveys no rational meaning to us. From their speeches it is not possible for us to know what exactly are the grievances about which they complain and what specific remedies they are capable of suggesting. No doubt that the anti-Panagal bias of theirs is the only one discernible factor arising out of the Swarajist medley of open commitments and sullen implications. But even this anti-Panagalism is not conveyed by them as a statement of a case carrying with it an uncontestable proof and irrefutable logic. On the other hand, what is being done is an endless repetition of a losely knit, incohate, downright slashing of a party in power, and based invaribly on either malice, petty rancour, or personal disappointments. So much so the Madras Swarajists' pleading of their cause is fast becoming a degraded rhetoric of machinations directed for the furtherance of a 'reform' that would be as disgusting as the present alleged impasse. These above words are undoubtedly of a strong expression. But I make no apology for using them because I feel and I do know that the consensus of public opinion in S. India does opine that the Madras Swarajists' propaganda in behalf of the Congress is by no means genuinely and earnestly for the furtherance of the Congress ideals, but for the exchange of personal ambitions in the nether-depths of power and pelf. It is disgusting to think that the Congress must have become the means for the satisfaction of inidealistic personal preferments—and with not even the solace of a single exception. In the hands of such political propagandists the Congress has

become a sop to some Cerberus. And even so, the political idealisms that are being preached by the Swarajists have lost the religious austerity they once had; they do not suggest the purity of motive of an older day; and they betray that the deity of disinterested national service has been outraged and prostituted and that she has now been thrown low down by the way-side dust. Hence what wonder if the assurances of the Madras Swarajists to the effect that they would take us on to Swaraj, the temple of freedom, fall flat on us or repel us with an unbearable nausea? If by now all of us have not got completely disgusted with the high-swelled talk of the Madras Swarajists, it means that it is only a question of time for the veil to be lifted. Nevertheless it is our paramount duty to bestir ourselves and with critical discrimination probe the lurid bubble of Swarajist promises and idealisms. With this end in view just now we can do no better than critically examine in general outlines what has been the water-level of the Swarajists as practical legislators in a clearly defined perspective.

In this connection I think it worth while to tell my readers about a pathetic confession made to me some time ago by an esteemed Congress leader who is at present, like Mahatma Gandhi, under a self-imposed seclusion. Since I have not his permission to disclose his name I cannot mention it. Nevertheless I can assure my readers that he is one who is well-informed and is respected and trusted in the Congress circles. He observed that the average capacity of the Congress politician is deplorably low and one that tends more and more towards deterioration. He was grieved, he said, that the great national awakening should have brought to the surface not giants, stalwarts, and self-reliant republicans, but weak-brained, uncultivated, immaturish posers, to

play for important stakes in the country's politics. Therefore he was pained to find inefficient Congress administration of local bodies, cantankerous bickerings in Congress organisations, and strange pig-headedness in Congress strategy. At this rate he was afraid that the mettle of national resistance offered against the bureaucracy would lose its nerve and tone and absolutely collapse with no chance of resurrection. He asked me what wonder there is in our civic problems being muddled through by the Congress legislators in a manner that is simply scandalous? If our 'affairs' have come to such an unfortunate pass, he said that the responsible leaders of the Congress must alone have to account for it. He felt very sorry indeed that in the over-wrought zeal of non-co-operation stimulus the sober leaders should have as their henchmen, confidants, and accredited agents men on the scrum of our social structure whose only credentials and qualifications for being regarded and made use of as our 'politicians' were the wearing of Khaddar and the serving of a term in the jails. Such strangely manufactured 'products' do now strut about the country with professions of worth and valour that sit with ill-grace on their substantial capacity.

The proof of this contention is close at hand in our own midst. Just take a review of the Swarajist block in the Madras Corporation. The leading lights on the ultra-nationalist bench cannot make any decent claim to a high order of intelligence, quick grasp of facts, administrative tact, and an all-round efficiency and zest for solid work. Hence these when seen in comparison with the former Councillors whom they have replaced come off only as second-rate burgomasters. Second-rate men undoubtedly they are. In a privileged position they stand not because of their own sheer merit, but owing to

the kind efforts of a powerful wave of queer prejudices that did once strangely enough sweep over the steady commonsense of the Madras intelligentsia. All that these Swarajist Councillors are capable of appears to be just this much—their readiness to move amazing amendments and an equal readiness to talk through their hats. Whatever 'brains' they might be displaying on the floor of the Corporation are not half so illuminating as those of the other non-Swarajist Councillors. In this connection we can go the length of asserting that no present Swarajist Councillor in point of efficiency and intellectual alertness could hold a candle to Councillors like Messrs. Desikachari, Thirumala Pillai, Thanikachellam Chetty, Ramaswamy Iyer, and Dr. Vijayaraghavulu. Any way it remains a fact that in the Corporation the Swarajists have come off not so 'finely' as they themselves would have wished or as what was predicated of them by their warmest admirers. Of course these Swarajist Councillors have to thank the Lord for small mercies. So it is that even in spite of themselves the 'affairs' of the Madras Corporation have not come to smack of such utter degeneracy as in the Corporation of Ahmedabad. If, however, we in Madras would wish to take a warning from Ahmedabad we ought not to allow any Swarajist candidate of the above type to be returned to the Corporation during the coming municipal elections. In this connection I wish to warmly urge my readers to bestir themselves towards a very vigorous and sustained propaganda for exposing the Swarajist halo of make-believe pretensions and promiscuous blarney.

Why is it that we should do so ? It is because the Pandora box of dishonest tricks ought not to be installed in our midst. Because credulity ought not to be

exploited. And because even Cinderella's imaginings can have no salt of the earth in their gifts to give us. Should this not be so ? What wrong is it to brush aside unsubstantial claims, probe critically the too well advertised bubble of Swarajist accomplishments, and without equivocation and in the clear light of conviction call a spade a spade ? That is why we need not demur in opining that the Swarajist 'services' in behalf of Labour have been pretentious and boalsted up. Who can call a Party that promised support for a capitalistic concern, on an agreement which brought some bounty for the Party but not a least bit of solace for Labour, the friend of Labour ? Who does not know the rather weird way in which the Swarajya Party carried on its negotiations with the Tatas? Who can forget the attitude of the Swarajist legislators towards the Maternity Bill ? Who does not remember the jeering indifference with which most Swarajists concerned themselves with Dewan Chamanlal's week-wage proposition ? Nor could any of us fail to recollect the utter indifference with which the Swarajists, who pretend to be the staunchest friends of Labour, went about to render 'help' to the strikers in the recent British general strike. No doubt during the Bombay mill-strike the Swarajists through their accredited organ. *The Bombay Chronicle,* did some good turn by Labour. But at that time not only the Swarajists but every school of politicians did render help to the mill-hands. And even here the Swarajists did not beat hollow the other political parties by any arresting and remarkable beneficence. These facts demonstrate that even granting that the Swarajists have taken care of Labour and have befriended it they cannot pretend that they alone have been the guardian angels of Labour. Labour could trust to the other non-Swarajist political parties as much as it could to the Swarajists themselves. More than this, the past has proved

beyond any cantankerous contention that the interest evinced by the Swarajists in Labour has been step-motherly and patronising. And as such if the Swarajists as an electioneering stunt just on the eve of the elections have been now making rapturous love to Labour, it must not lose its head over the proferred wine of Swarajist solicitude. It has to remember that the sincere, true friends of Labour who can render some 'practical service', and not just rear a Mahmout's couch on into the clouds, are not necessarily in the Swarajya Party. Besides, we respectfully and earnestly urge Labour to remember that some of its staunchest and truest friends are outside the Swarajist pale. Hence would it be too much to ask of Labour just this one request, that it must take the Swarajists' proferred love in its behalf with ample grains of salt, that it must not too readily put its faith in the Swarajist promises, and to know that its substantial interests have been far safer in non-Swarajist hands than in those of the Swarajists? Having asked this much, might we not go a little ahead and implore Labour not to promise its support to Swarajist imbroglios, because it is really in the interests of our country at this juncture that Labour must not get encrusted with faked glamories and dead-weight of negations from the thrice trumpeted Swarajists? Once more we ask of Labour, beware of the Swarajist net and do not get caught in its treacherous trappings.

Not only has Labour to reject the wooings of the Swarajists, but every other electorate has to do very much the same. This we urge owing to a very substantial reason. In this connection let us remind the electorate that it has to choose its candidates for either of these two following considerations—on account of the candidate's individuality and his capacitv and worth, or on account of the general competence of the Party of which he is a

member. No doubt if a candidate is satisfactory on both the counts he would be the best choice with no two opinions on it. Accordingly the electorate must decide whether each Swarajist candidate by himself satisfies the requisite conditions that go on to make him a competent or decent 'representative'—or it must envisage how far the Swarajya Party has the sufficiency, the worth, and the werewithal to render a good account of its needs and aspirations. Some of the Swarajist candidates are undoubtedly able men, but unfortunately they do not happen to be within the territorial jurisdiction of our presidency. In Madras almost all the Swarajist candidates individually have nothing of an intrinsic worth in them to warrant their backing by the electorate. Therefore the Swarajist candidates have been pleading that at the hands of the electorate they deserve a preferential treatment on the score that they belong to the Congress which according to their valuation is the only political party in India capable of guaranteeing the effective pressagement of the country's national aspirations and the fulfilment of its urgent needs. In other words, the Swarajist candidates concede that the Congress as a political organisation is full of healthy, national life, absolutely virile and highly dependable. Therefore as the protagonists of such a party the Swarajists assert that they are best qualified to represent the electorates. But is the Congress just at present really a fortalice of all such high virtues-unparalleled efficiency and unquestionable integrity ? A little more careful examination into the body and soul of the Congress will reveal the solid fact about it that most of its claims for being the ensemble of the country's robust, staunchest, elevated, and efficient nationalism are too fanciful if not altogether far too pretentious. We do, however, admit that the Congress is an effective political party, But we none-

theless declare that as a political party it is as good as any other and that it has no especial virtues about it that other parties do not possess. There is no ground for singling out the Congress as a political party possessing unique virtues. The Congress no doubt is nationalistic. But a lively sense of nationalism and of the nationalistic stature are not the exclusive monopoly of the Congress. Other political parties are also coloured through with the above envisagements. When thus it is clear that the Congress is as good or as bad as any other political party in the country, there is no reason why the electorate should show any special differential attitude towards its behests or why it should prefer its nominees to the exclusion of others just on the score that they enjoy its benedictions.

Now at least we trust that it is clear that there are no special reasons for choosing the Congress candidates alone. But on the other hand there is enough of justification for keeping them out. For one thing it has been shown that most of the Congress candidates from the standpoint of individual capacity and worth and efficiency have not been of the 'right sort.' Because of this the only justification for choosing them must be on the ground that they belong to the Congress. But it has been also shown that the Congress can make no pretensions to any exclusive virtues which do not embellish other political parties. Moreover it must not be forgotten that the Congress now has lost all its former pink of political health and that it is in a creepy state of morbidity surrounded by the fog of irresolute political atavism. Its heart is not sound and it does not know its own way. It has stupidly embarked on uncharted seas. Its dementing vision and dotage make it shift and change at every turn. In this predicament it is nearing to come under the guidance of Buridan's asses. These will lead

it not to the land of promise but to a veritable Adonis' garden.

On such a Congress should we rely ? Should we instal its votaries in our political pantheons and worship them as gods and submit to their dictates? What benefit could we derive by backing up during the coming elections effete and inefficient men who are standing as the sponsors of a Congress that is fast sailing with blinded vision on uncharted seas ? What is it we can expect from men who can lead us only to intransigeances and negations of an Adonis' garden ? Nothing to be proud of or worth treasuring. Therefore it is the duty of every honest patriot not to back up at the coming elections the Swarajist candidates. This duty becomes paramount when we consider all the dangers we would be exposed to by sailing with the Congress.

VII

Not unto an Adoni's Garden

The Ashes of revolt—Paralysis of national resistance —The regulation thunders of a constitutional opposition— The consequential juxtaposition—Prudent course in the light of the above juxtaposition—Swarajists' obstinacy and the Electorates' clear duty in the light of it—Through Swarajists' promises to an Adoni's Garden,—So, what then?

In the last article we stated that the Congress was going to be dominated by Buridan's asses who would surely lead it only to an Adoni's garden. This predication of the Congress fortunes would be resented by some of the sensitive patriots in the country as being too sweeping and too arbitrary. Who knows they might not pour forth on the writer's head wrath and brimstone and fiire for having suggested an atrabilarian debris as the inevitable solatium now available for all the heroic suffering, sacrifice, and travail of the past six momentous years. Though I might afford not to be upset over the ire of Congress protagonists, I will not be so cynically brutal as to question the sincerity, sacrifice and the suffering of those Congressmen who in the past few months are coming to head the national movement. If however, anyone were to question in such a fashion the answer uttered through disinterested and dispassionate voices would be that it is comme il faut. That is why I here now assert that all the talk of the Congress tall-poppies and their professions of altruistic service in behalf of the country's national interests are merely Vox

et pratera nihil. But, however, we need not now much concern ourselves with such like trumpetings of blazoned advertisements, for what is of a more immediate and paramount concern for us is to know how far the non-co-operation movement, in its spirit and superstructure, as conveyed through the Congress, is to-day alive and what exactly is its state of vitality. In evaluating this aspect of the question, it is unnecessary for us to go into any great detail about the many momentous happenings of the past seven years, because the broad outlines of these years are too fresh in our minds to need a further re-capitulation of their story. It is enough for us to state that from the time of the Calcutta Special Congress, Indian politics as represented through the Congress took the form ot a deeply surcharged national protest and an impetuous national challenge against the accredited political ideas and aspirations of a former day. It was then as though a self-respecting nation had determined to throw off the yoke of its servitude and that for that supreme purpose it had heroically made up its resolve to sacrifice its status, privileges, past associations, obligations, memories, and loyalties. Perhaps then it looked as though the immemorial East had at last awakened to the drum-beat of service by the political ethics of Western progress. It all looked so. But none the less the Congress had failed to touch the core of things. From it there emanated not the slow and scarcely audible murmurings of a great people but the froth of discontent from the trustee-section of teeming millions. The middle class Indian intelligentsia put on the garb of revolutionary protest, spoke the voice of political martyrdom, invoked the Spirit and the Deity, and in the name of the Ten Commandments forced itself into lines of frontal attack for securing and establishing political and spiritual self-determination.

But so much of a specification was the outcome of a passing sensitiveness and some irritating morbidity. The only substantial part of it was the logical sequel of what had already happened. And this part was really adjustable within the confines of a constitution, amenable to the tyranny of dates, and expatiable through propositions and amendments. This indeed was the core of the N. C. O. achievement. Of course for a good while it was clouded over by the revolutionary idealisms of an exalted political philosophy. Those that were entirely led by these surface colourings of the movement were soon to be disillusioned. Those who addressed themselves to the dictates of the Spirit as emanating from the greatest of the living Messiahs soon came to know that what they themselves were really concerned with was the 'amendation' of the Government of India Act. That is why they knew that there was no good in their attempting to furrow the field of Bardoli. Thus at last they came to feel that they were after all those men who could just turn their eyes not on Bardoli but on Raisina. But this shifting of the gaze was done with all the pomp and splendour of a new ritual, which was conveyed completely by the poses, the principles and the promises of the Swarajya Party. With this party's formation, the older gusto of a nationalist protest in the Congress came to be deadened slowly and cautiously till it completely ceased to breathe any life. Thus with the ensured success of the Swarajya Party was also 'ensured' the extinction of the spirit of revolt in the N.-C.-O. movement. That movement settled itself down. It came to securely know its terra firma, although it did continue to talk, not of its palpable foot-hold, quite demonstrable to one's commonsense, but of the stars and of catching the moon by her horns.

But even this talk has now evaporated. And just at present the Congressmen have taken their stand on the cold ashes of their former nationalistic revolt. Their impossible idealisms, with all their affront, have flown to the winds. That is why they have begun to silently reckon the impossibility of mass-civil-disobedience, the impracticability of individual civil-disobedience, and the nebulity of group civil-disobedience. They have come to feel that khaddar—adherance is a sacerdotal tyranny out of place and out of joint in constitutional organisations meant for political ends. They would not resent the suggestion that Hindi as our lingua franca is an innocent fad. They do not demur to infer that their labour in behalf of Hindu-Muslim Unity is frustrated. In other words, most of the Congressmen would have to admit that their present status quo is one which totally denies them all the vitality behind 'sanctions'. In fact to-day, standing as they do on the cold ashes of a former nationalist protest, they cannot even speak of 'sanction' because 'direct action' has completely departed from the pale of their cognisance. Hence towards an accomplishment of their high endeavours they have not the barest sustenance or wherewithal. Their national resistance as originally planned and focussed has absolutely paralysed. No wonder, therefore, the No-changers are nowhere in any discernible potency. The ambassadors of Hindu-Muslim Unity have fast parted company. The Legislatures are no longer to be looked upon as mere fissiparous mirages and Councils of Maya; but on the other hand they are to be admitted as the only substantially discernible spec on the political horizon the Congress politicians are able to see at. Very naturally the Swarajists do walk out of the Legislatures, but thereafter they do not go to their 'masters' and invoke their 'sanction' but they do once again walk-in. The Legislatures are loudly declared as

both a sham and a tosh ; but nonetheless the entire concern of the Swarajists is how best to get returned to them with the biggest possible majorities. But, again, when once they are in them the Swarajists will not resort to 'wrecking' since they are fully aware that both themselves and others in the country are heartily sick of such deadlocks. This is because the Swarajists are logical men whose keen intelligence points out the intellectual absurdity and the practical nullity of 'wreckings, not followed by 'direct-action.' This is the pass to which Swarajists have come. They have been transformed into a new mould out of whose crystal depths they can clearly envisage the utter collapse of their national resistance from the standpoint of the N. C. O. movement. At the end the Swarajists must be knowing that what they have at present, and about which they are keen, is the legislative spaciousness under the Reform Councils.

In other words, the Swarajists after many chequered wanderings have come back once again on to the same high-road the Congress was marching on till 1920. That is to say from the peculiar extremity of the N. C. O. movement, the Congress is working back to the old principle of constitutional agitation. However maligned, distorted, ridiculed and abused was 'constitutional agitation' in the five years, between 1920 and 1925, it is once again a *chif deuvre* in the Swarajist Bible. Therefore, it is that all the Swarajist war-cry of 'wrecking' and obstruction has been drifted on to new tunes on the old models. Thus once more we have been witnessing the interesting spectacle of a national revolt subsiding into, what the latest issue of the 'Round Table' calls, 'the regulation thunders of a constitutional opposition.' This transformation is, no doubt, amazing, but we need not

doubt it or marvel at it. It will be found the most logical of all logical sequences, especially when one remembers how the N. C. O. protest did not really touch the heart of the vast teeming millions, how the Hindu-Muslim Unity has been broken into innumerable fragments, how in its stead there is everywhere distrust, suspicion, and enmity between community and community, how mass civil-disobedience has become sheerly impossible of fulfilment, how this one sustaining weapon of non-violent non-co-operation has become absolutely paralytic, how the original professions of the Swarajists viz., 'wrecking' and 'obstruction,' have been compromised stage after stage, how later on the Swarajists have been displaying an overfondness for a lease ot life within the legislatures, and how the Swarajists as much as any one else have come face to face with only two alternatives, viz., either direct violent revolt, which the Swarajists dare not and cannot undertake, or 'constitutional agitation' in and through the legislatures.

It is well, indeed, that the Swarajist war-cries should have comfortably settled down to the regulation thunders of a constitutional opposition. Because we do know that no good can accrue to us from fire-eating. When, thus, it is not possible for us by any kinds of 'sanction' to force the bureaucracy to concede the utmost of our political ambitions, there is precious little good in merely talking through one's hat. It is best to face the situation squarely in its face, and then act with prudence and tact. At the present, our 'situation' is quite clear. We have not been able to force the British Government to concede all that we want. The N.C.O. experiment has proved to us that as yet we are not capable of forcing the British Government to yield us all its highest privileges and closest preserves. We have been found not strong enough

to bring the bureaucracy on its bended knees. We are not capable of raising ourselves to a position from where we can afford to dictate our own terms. Perhaps at some future day we might be able, if the gods so will it, to make the bureaucracy accept defeat at our hands. But to-day we are not in a position to do so. We know it, and the bureaucracy also knows it. Hence all the Swarajists' talk of fighting the bureaucracy and driving it to the last ditch is stupidly devoid of any sense. Such a talk is only a tall-talk of innocuous vanity and the only garb of consolation on our impotency that has been amply demonstrated. That is why Sir Alexander Muddiman 'brushed aside' the walk-out-statement of Pundit Motilaljee with the complacent observation that Genesis is more commendable than Exodus. Sir Alexander thus could rightly afford to be so happily cynical at the point of what appears to British journalist sojourners, who have not as yet established the touch with the real state of affairs in India, as a grave constitutional crisis. In Great Britain a parliamentary statement of the type of Pundit Motilaljee's would mean a substantial, real, and imminent political crisis. In India, it has meant, and must mean, a swashbuckler's ink horn terms. Thus this is the only sort of game we are capable of. We know it, and our 'adversaries' are equally aware of it. If so, who can deceive whom, and for how long?

Therefore, as 'practical statesmen' it is not in the least desirable that we should be courting to become the citizens of a political isle of lanterns. Remember, we should, that pretensions cannot mean the strength behind cold steel. Moreover it is magnanimous, and under the circumstances quite prudent, not to look a gift horse in its mouth. We will, therefore, accept with grace whatever further reforms might be granted to us. With grace because we cannot on our own exertions force reforms to

be extended to us. Of course 'with grace' need not mean in servility. And as such 'constitutional agitation' need not connote political mendicancy. In all things there is room for heroic stature. And how even we could assume that stature is being demonstrated by the inaugurators of the Indian National Party. Because of the 'gift' we have to keep our eyes on the givers of the gift also. They want us to work out dyarchy for the coming three years—work it as best as we can with all its manifest, apparent, and imaginary defects. Why not we satisfy them by fulfilling this requisite condition? To submit to conditions imposed upon by the 'master' may be humiliating. But as long as you cannot force the 'master' to concede the concessions you want, you have either to obey him in case you want them or not obey him in case you do not in the least mind not having them. Therefore, we have to satisfy the condition imposed by the British Government by 'working' the 'reforms' for the next three years in case we want a further grant of reforms. We, including the Swarajists, are agreed that we do want a further grant. We know we cannot force the Government to grant them to us, and we know that the 'further grant' must come by way of a concession. In that case ought we not first try to satisfy the 'condition' imposed upon us by our 'masters'? If we wish not to obey the 'condition', then we must be prepared not to receive the promised 'further grant'. If so, once again we have to ask the Swarajists whether they are prepared not to have any 'further grant' but remain where they are at present? If that be so, the Swarajists can very well afford not to comply with the obligation imposed upon us. But it is clear from the Swarajists' performances and commitments that they are not content with remaining where they are at present and that they are decidedly for a 'further grant'

of reforms. They cannot get this 'further grant' except by way of a concession. Therefore, it is in their interests to see that they fulfil the specific conditions laid down by the " masters."

If the Swarajists do not want a 'further grant' by way of a concession and a gift from the British Government, it is up to them to clearly declare their intention and quit the legislatures. Because by now it has been proved that they are incapable of forcing the British Government to grant us further reforms. By 'wrecking' the legislatures the Swarajists hoped to bring the 'masters' on their knees and meet our demands; but in this attempt they have failed. They have failed because the complete 'wrecking' in two provinces has been balanced by other concessions in other forms, concessions which have riddled 'wrecking' into 'discriminatory obstruction'; and also because even 'complete wrecking' when fully carried out affords them no 'sanction' with which they could bring the Government of the country to a standstill and a collapse. Therefore, by now, the Swarajists must admit that in the legislatures their programme has yielded them the most barren results. They must admit that by remaining in the legislatures with the principles laid out by them they cannot take India on to a further mead of reforms. Thus the Swarajists must have to confess that the end for which they entered the legislatures has not been realised by them. They have also to acknowledge that the end cannot be realised through the means they have devised. Therefore with those very means in vogue the Swarajists in the legislatures can function into nothing. This fact must be admitted by them without any reservation.

Instead of making such an admission, the Swarajists are still misleading unsophisticated people by promis-

ing them that with their 'methods' and by remaining in the legislatures they can 'force' further reforms from the British Government. In this way to misrepresent their own incapacity is dishonest in the extreme. They ought not to mislead the people and exploit their credulity. Since their 'plans' and 'methods' have failed to function, they must admit the failure. If still the Swarajists want to stay in the legislatures they will have to abandon their old ticket and present a new one before the electorate for enjoying its suffrage. If, however, the Swarajists decline to change their old ticket for a new one but still persist in trading on it, then it becomes our duty to clearly tell the electorate that this ticket of the Swarajists does not in the least equate with the Swarajists' actual worth and capacity. We must also tell the electorate that it is dangerous to return at this juncture the Swarajists on their old ticket for pursuing still their old tactics which after being tried have been found to be futile. It is dangerous for this reason: if the Swarajists are 'returned' on the same old lines, they will enter the legislatures and create there unseemly, compromising, illogical deadlocks, but nothing more precious or consequential; this fact will be carefully weighed by the coming Statutory Commission whose verdict in the light of such Swarajist intransigeance will surely go against our cause; thus by trusting the Swarajists, we will be all the poorer, for their intransigeance while it cannot by itself help us to any extent will positively render us a disservice by giving a handle to the Statutory Commission to pass its verdict against our interests. In this connection the retort might be slashed against the above argument that it holds water only in case anyone were to care for the Statutory Commission. We all have to care for it, because without it and in spite of it, we are not in a position to have our demands met.

By now, it must be clear to my readers how dangerous it is for us to allow in the coming three years Swarajist intransigeances to thrive once again in our legislatures. Therefore, it becomes the paramount concern of all of us to keep out the Swarajists at the coming elections, unless it be that the Swarajists consent to so alter their ticket as to make it beat in consonance with the exigencies of the hour and our peculiar conditions. If thus the Swarajists have to be kept out, it must be done by our 'returning' the candidates of the Justice Party in Madras and the candidates of the Responsivists and the Indian National Parties elsewhere in the country. If these non-Swarajist candidates are 'returned' they will in the coming three years render such an account of themselves in the legislatures as would carry a great weight of conviction to the coming Statutory Commission. In this connection I would very respectfully appeal to the electorate to unhesitatingly back up at the coming elections the non-Swarajists and keep out the Swarajists until the Swarajists agree to entirely shift their present moorings, which lead those who trust them through treachery to some unholy decrepitude.

But just now it would appear that the Swarajists under the dictation of their newest 'Leader' are not in a humour to shift their moorings. This leader and his henchmen are determined to play once again the old stunt of 'wrecking.' That is why Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar has been priding over the fact that he it was he who was responsible for the Sabarmati pact being buried five fathoms deep. In this iconoclasts' opinion that achievement must appear as a meritorious and distinguished service by the country for which he says he professes a great love. He can very well gloat over the fact that he has prevented what would have been the most

harmonious consummation and conservation of political forces in the country. By thus dividing still further the Responsivist and the Swarajist ranks, he has not grafted anything of a Doric Reed. By such a 'service' as rendered by Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar, the country does not stand to any substantial profit. That 'service' might have yielded him a diadem of cheap, popular applause. With it he might have his vanities satisfied. But at the end he will realise that what he has after all been able to gather about him is the dust of a drab notoriety.

Of such a person there is no need to say that he does not seem to possess the virtue of Fronde's cat even. Therefore what wonder if he brings to the country's service as his gifts the seedlings of an Adoni's garden? He has now begun a new note for the benefit of his followers. And while sounding it he has not minded those confessions of maturer Swarajists we referred to in the beginning of this article. That is why when Swarajists like Pundit Motilaljee have been admitting the impracticability of mass civil-disobedience and direct action, Mr. Iyengar has the cheek to publicly declare before a Delhi audience some time in March last that it was his considered opinion that the country was ready for mass civil disobedience. His followers, especially those dependent on him by many ties about which we need not now consider, are echoing that pontifical enunciation. With equal bravado this leader has been asserting that it would not do for Swarajists if 'returned' at the coming elections to accept office. Of course, we have already seen (in the 5th article) what all clever subterfuges he has laid below the non-acceptance-of-office episode. However that may be, Mr. Iyengar is conveying to the public his view that the ancient reactionarism of the Swarajya Party ought to be renovated and perpetuated

This he promises to do from the presidential gadi of the Assam Congress. In behalf of this reactionarism, he has been courting the support of the public by promises that are quite winsome and alluring at first sight. These promises are, however, absolutely beyond the capacity of a person like Mr. Iyengar. For his is not the stature that can be up to fulfilling them. Still he does not hesitate to formulate them. Thus he assures the public that if only they were to trust him as the President of the Congress he would bring about Hindu-Muslim Unity; he would prepare the country for mass civil-disobedience and thus frighten the bureaucracy out of its wits; he would thereafter compel the bureaucracy to grant complete and uuqualified Swaraj; he would establish 'khadi' on the strongest possible foundation; and that he would see that the country gets back to its ancient state of peace, plenty and prosperity. Such promises are very alluring. Therefore quite possibly people might be lured and deceived to stand by them and swear by them. If with this end in view they were to back up Mr. Iyengar and his Swarajist followers, soon they will discover at the end that what the Swarajists promised them is only a most dishonest hiatus of an Adoni's garden. Therefore they would do well not to be deceived by the Swarajit promises of the above type. The people must be aware that the Swarajists can secure for them not even a tith of their grandiloquent promises. They must know that the reactionarism on whose basis Mr. Iyengar and his followers promise to erect and rear their ideal state is impotent, mischievous and baneful. Impotent because we have seen it has not the power to force the bureaucracy to grant Swaraj for our benefit. Mischievous because if permitted to reign, it would prevent other factors, which can yield to the people a moiety of a limited but substantial reform, from functioning. And

baneful because while it itself can be of no avail, it would surely give the bureaucracy a handle to suggest that because of such a wanton reactionarism and intransigeance we do not deserve to be treated gracefully and that we have not deserved any further concessions on its part. Thus at the end we would be where we now are in case ws were to trust the appeals of the Madras swarajist leader and back up by our votes the reactionarism he is now sponsoring.

When such is the actual situation, what is the clear duty, especially at the time of the elections, of every honest, patriotic Indian? Is it not to strain to our utmost capacity for defeating the Swarajists at the coming elections—defeat them quite hollow and to the blue? Is it not that we should emphatically and in a most telling fashion protest when political panhandlers, as the American saying has it, begin to guide our political destinies? This duty of ours will appear all the more certain when we consider the other 'consideration' in our next article which will be the last of this series.

VIII

Hence our Duty

Trusteeship and its concomittants—Delivering the goods—Recapitulation—Let not the donkey mean one thing and the driver another.

In the last article it was pointed out that the 'tree-smearing protest' of the non-co-operation revolt had died of its warmth and glow and that only its cold ashes now lay on the surface. During all the time when this process was taking place, to the ardent N.-C.-O.'s. and the Swarajist enthusiasts, Hindu-Muslim Unity was in the nature of Civitas Dei to the Christians. Especially, the idealists among the non-violent revolt hoped dearly and deeply to make of the Hindu-Muslim Unity a first-rate facade in the nationalist political structure that was to be built out of their devoted labours and colossal sacrifices. With that end in view, they did attempt the task. Something of an appreciable super-structure was erected, but before the builders could embellish it with accepted and mutually acceptable dogmas of inter-racial amity and national integrity as being beyond and above mere communal affinity, it was discovered that the super-structure was fast sinking down, as it had been laid out, owing to a huge blunder, on the quick-sands of political make-shift. And to-day the least traces of it are all gone. This misadventure saddens us deeply. If, however, we are referring to it, it is not because we as the opponents of the non-co-operators are gloating over their utter discomfort ; it is because we want all of us to carefully note the grave implications of this histori-

cal fact. That to-day in the country there is no love lost between the two communities is a fact, nay an unassailable fact. In addition to this, elsewhere in the country mistrust and jealousy and bickerings exist between community and community. Thus, for instance, in S. India, of late, there has certainly been a rift in the lute between the brahmins and the nonbrahmins viewing them as political units. This disunity and this rift have been so deeply surcharged that they have completely invaded the entire political conciousness of the country. So much so every one of us, at any rate, most of us—have got into the habit of viewing political issues through the standpoint of communal implications. Necessarily, there is every danger of the sacredness of the 'vote' being entirely misunderstood and prostituted into a very negation ot democratic outlook and purpose. If thus we were to begin to exercise our 'vote' on communal considerations, for communal motives, and through communal predelictions, it would be utterly impossible for us to rear a truly democratic form of self-Government. Those that can exercise the 'vote' as it ought to be in our teeming millions are very few indeed. Added to this fact, is the other one that our teeming millions are uneducated and illiterate. This does not suggest that our teeming millions are uncultivated and uncultured. They do display a remarkable 'finesse' of human worth and a delicacy of a great 'noblesse' of character. But they are illiterate as far as the political conscience behind a free, democratic, self-governing state is concerned. Even if just to-morrow Great Britain were to grant us Swaraj or full self-Government or even if we were to gain complete independence, the governance of our country will not be democratic in the sense in which it is fully understood in the West, because our masses are ill-equipped to function as free citizens in an absolutely democratic state. Till illiteracy departs and 'politically' the masses are educated in our

country, there cannot be the government of the people, for the people, and by the people. This fact necessitates the element of trusteeship in the constitutional and political structure of our country. This trusteeship is personated by the middle-class intelligentsia which figures as "the politicians" through the press and the platform. And this trusteeship is in behalf of the teeming masses. Prior to the present momentous decade, this trusteeship was being discharged by the servants of the crown—the Nawabs of the Indian Civil. But now the middle-class Indian intelligentsia is demanding that instead of the I.C.S. members it would carry on that trusteeship, on the principle that the Executive is made subordinate and amenable to the Legislature. Only this principle bestows on the system of Government we are keen on making popular the impress of self-government. In other words what we are agitating about is not the introduction and practice of democratic self-government but the transfer of a trusteeship which would be carried out on one of the main principles of democratic government.

In other words, the agitation of all schools of Indian politicians is for the change of burden in the trusteeship. The middle-class intelligentsia wants that it and not the foreign bureaucracy should administer the country in behalf of the masses. For this task there ought to be a working understanding and harmony between the various men who form the trusteeship. But just at present among the Indian middle class intelligentsia this working harmony and understanding are woefully wanting. Though they are all members of an intended trusteeship which they wish to be perpetuated as an efficient agency, they have between themselves mutual bickerings, animosities, and petty differences, all of which will go to

bring about a disharmony and a want of co-operation among themselves who are to wield great responsibilities. (Just note how very difficult it was for the Hon'ble Sir Mitra to form a reconciliation-board of Mussalman and Hindu leaders in Calcutta.) When there is such a dissipation of cordiality among the members of the trusteeship, it has to be apprehended how far the trusteeship would be effectively run and impartially administered. Naturally grave doubts begin to be entertained as to the smooth running of the machine after it has passed hands. This aspect of the issue will not be lost sight of by the Statutory Commission when it begins evaluating the debit and credit side of our politico-administrative ability and efficiency displayed during all these years from 1919 onwards. If we wish to come off worthily, with praise and approbation, at the hands of the Statutory Commission, we must prove ourselves to be worthy of the high task we wish to undertake on our shoulders.

For that end we must take every care to see that the men who would 'run' our legislatures are men who can be worthy of 'delivering the goods.' To deliver the goods is no slight task; it is one that requires maturity, outlook, probity of character, vision, and commonsense. Therefore, it is not as though anyone could do it. And it is not as though everyman can rush to it. In this connection, it may not be out of place to remark that on a great historic occasion some of the most stalwart of Indian politicians miserably failed to deliver the goods; and as yet it has not been appreciated how much of havoc has been wrought owing to this dismal failure. What was well-neigh beyond the capacity of those stalwarts is bound to be not a trifling affair in the hands of the rag and bobtail Swarajist politicians. These

Swarajists, especially of the type we are having in Madras, are incapable of adequately discharging this burden. For one thing, their mental outlook is in a diseased state of utter morbidity. Otherwise how could one explain the reckless effrontery of Mr. Satyamoorthy, when in the course of the debate in the Madras Council on Mr. Yakub Hassan's ban, he declared: "I hold that it is the patriotic duty of every Indian to preach disaffection against the present Government"? Of course, we are not concerned how Mr. Satyamoorthy conducts himself or what views he expresses; but what we do wish to state is that it is our opinion that a political party that counts upon men like Mr. Satyamoorthy and admits of sentiments like the ones referred to above ought not to be the party that will step in to deliver the goods. Because we hold the view that such a party embodies the very negation of all those qualities of head and heart requisite for an adequate discharging of this burden of delivering the goods. As opposed to such a party, we do stand its opponents and the friends of the British Government. There is no mistaking our attitude. It, therefore, becomes our immediate and utmost concern to see that a party, like the one to which Mr. Satyamoorthy has the honour to belong as one of its important shining lights, is not returned to the legislatures at the coming elections. In this connection, I earnestly request our Zamindars not to consent to join the Congress or to help Congress candidates at the elections. We know that some Swarajist leaders are endeavouring their utmost to draw in the Zamindars into their net. The Zamindars ought to be aware that they have nothing in common with this party which counts as its members, among others, political iconoclasts and sneaky seditionicts.

Thus, on the above score, the Swarajists deserve to be kept out at the coming elections. Even otherwise they do not deserve to enjoy the confidence of the electorate. With all their peculiar fundamentals, the Swarajists will not be able to serve the needs of the country, especially because of the 'peculiar' situation in which she is placed to-day. This party, particularly in Madras, has crooked outlook and aims of the impossible. Its personnel is weak, inefficient, and untrustworthy. It is not bent upon serving faithfully even the ideals of the Congress. It has its ulterior motives and exterior semblances. All this was narrated in the last seven articles. And for the benefit of the reader they will be re-marshelled in a bare outline just here:—

(1) The Swarajists' (especially of the Madras fraternity) main concern is the coming elections.

(2) Anti-Panagalism is their real objective.

(3) They are employing false pretensions and claims.

(4) They are forming phalanxes at the sacrifice of the most of the important Congress principles.

(5) The Madras Swarajists are mainly guided by the principle of modus-Sreevaishnavendi. They want to re-establish the brahmin-lawyer-ascendency in Madras politics, as it was prior to 1914. This ascendêncy is sought to be definitely Sree-Vaishnavait.

(6) The Swarajists are perpetrating massacres of constitutional principles. They are outraging principles of representation, of demarcation of legislative and civic programmes of work, and of allegiance to mandates.

(7) The Swarajists are trading on the stunt of non-acceptance of office.

(8) This non-acceptance stunt has been subjected to a very clever and deft wire-pulling by the Swarajist

leaders, especially the Acting Leader of the Swarajya Party.

(9) By this stunt, the Swarajist leaders are trying to mislead innocent folk.

(10) Most of the Swarajist rank and file now on the scene are inefficient and immaturish. They are posers and not politicians.

(11) Therefore, the Congress administration of local bodies is absolutely unsatisfactory.

(12) The Swarajists are not particularly the boon friends of Labour.

(13) Labour must remember that its interests are safer in non-Swarajist hands than in those of the Swarajists.

(14) The Congress led by the Swarajists forgets that to-day it has no 'sanction' in the country, that its 'constructive programme' has gone to the dust, and that Hindu-Muslim unity nowhere now exists.

(15) In spite of these irrefutable and distressing facts, the Swarajists are holding on promises that cannot be fulfilled by them.

(16) The Congress is fast coming under the guidance of Buridan's assess.

(17) These are about to lead the Congress on unchartered seas.

(18) The Congress under such guidance will only rear an Adoni's garden.

(19) Such protagonists of an Adoni's garden do not deserve to be the deliverers of goods.

(20) It is necessary, especially in the light of the coming Statutory Commission, that for the com ng three years we should have in the legislatures politicians who are capable of 'delivering the goods.'

(21) For this end, we all have to 'keep out' the Swarajists at the coming elections. In this connection, the Zamindars must kindly co-operate with us by not helping the Swarajists.

(22) And thus by keeping out the Swarajists, we should help the members of the Responsivist, the Justice, and the Indian National Parties in the country.

Having re-capitulated all the arguments set forth in this series, I now respectfully ask my readers to definitely know what their duty is in the clear light of conscience, sobriety, and political fairplay. Let us not then forget that the political situation in our country is such that we cannot establish immediately a real democratic self-government. We, as practical politicians, can only aspire to a political trusteeship in behalf of the vast teeming millions. Even before we can reach up to this trusteeship, we have to march a pretty long way on the high-road of constitutional practices and precedents and conventions. This journey of ours, to use a metaphor, is being assisted by a political engine. But about it we have complained that it creaks and jolts too often. This is admitted by our 'English Masters'. They are, therefore, prepared to allow us to have a freehand as foremen and oilmen of this political engine. In this light, the best among the British Statesmen are extending to us their hand in friendship and co-operation. Why should we decline to receive it? For one thing, we ourselves, out of our own accruments, cannot achieve anything more handsome or anything of ampler demarcations. Therefore it is wise and becoming of us to put on a

cheerful face and accept just that alone which at this hour can come to us. Is it urbane not to accept the proferred friendliness of some of the great Christian gentlemen who are now presiding over our political destinies? Should sympathies as expressed in these following noble words of Sir Basil Blackett:—......I do not think it is open to challenge that the depths of understanding of man's relation to the infinite which have been attained by the best of India's speculative thinkers hold out to Western civilization as it exists to-day a hope of spiritual progress which is an essential complement and corrective to the materialism which springs from over-emphasis on the practical business of conquest of nature's secrets and compulsion to man's service. India, long ago, revolutionised Mathematics and provided the West with the key to the most far-reaching of all among the mechanical instruments on which its control of nature has been built, when it presented to Europe, through the medium of Arabia, the device of the cypher, upon which all modern systems of numeration depend. Even so, India to-day or to-morrow will, I feel confident, revolutionise Western doctrines of progress by demonstrating the insufficiency and lack of finality of much of the Wests' present system of human values . . . —be lost on us?

We should prove that we well deserve of them and of the political faith they embody. This we can do by returning at the next general elections, not Swarajist fire-eaters, who would set their teeth against broad statesmanship and deep, sincere sympathies, and also unabashingly emulate the ethics of the dog in the manger, but by 'sending in' those candidates representing the Responsivist, the Justice, and the Indian National Parties, who do know what as apart from fire-eating is sober nationalism

coupled to decent opposition. The need of the hour imperatively demands we should instal in our political councils and legislatures sober nationalism and decent opposition. If we succeed in this accomplishment we will then have nothing to regret for. Otherwise, if Swarajists are once again reinstated, at the hour of reckoning, which will soon be in about 1929, we all will have to rue that with reference to the casting of our political fortunes the donkey has been meaning one thing and the driver another. Would we allow such a plight to overtake us? We hope not. As a mark of our earnestness in this behalf, let us all bestir ourselves to prevent a further 'exploitation' by the Swarajists through their 'return' at the elections. And let us prevent this exploitation' by unhesitatingly helping the non-Swarajist candidates with all the earnestness, strength and good cheer at our command.

Appendix A (1)

The "Bengalee" publishes a letter written by a responsible Bengal Swarajist to a member of the present Bengal Government. The following is the text of the letter :—

HINDUSTHAN BUILDINGS,
6-A, Corporation Street,
Calcutta, the 25th May, 1926.

My Dear,—For some time past you have urged on me the necessity of a change in our policy and party programme as being called for and useful in our interest. I, however, have so far been unable to agree with you, thinking it both necessary and proper, in the present circumstances, to stand by our old principle of non-acceptance of the Ministry. Of late the situation has no doubt somewhat changed and it appears to me that if the Government should be willing and able to take advantage of the altered circumstances, it may not be impossible to induce the Congress Party now to meet the Government half-way and to accept office. Let me state at the outset that our Party was never averse to any honourable compromise with the Government of Lord Lytton. His Excellency must have been aware of this from his conversation with Deshabandu Das himself.

Lord Lytton, I am told, complains that he has been thoroughly misunderstood in this province. Nobody has, however, yet questioned that he is a straight, well-meaning and liberal-minded gentleman; and personally I

am of opinion that he may yet do some lasting good to this province if he can rise to the occasion by making a suitable compromise with the predominant political party.

The question would immediately arise as to the minimum terms which on the one hand will be insisted upon and which the Government on the other may honourably accept. It seems to be for one thing that it will not be possible for the Congress Party to accept office in any case so long as the political prisoners are not released. As you know, public opinion in the province is strongly and unequivocally against the detention of the gentlemen in question without trial, and no party dependent on or sympathetic to the public feeling can overlook without self-destruction this very definite opinion of the country. Nor would the Swaraj Party think it honourable to form a Ministry while scores of young men are kept in confinement, often in unhealthy places, without any ground deemed sufficient by their countrymen or proved in a court of law.

As for myself, I cannot see what harm there can be in releasing these gentlemen now, even from the Government's own point of view. You, also, must be aware of the fact that the inclination of most of internees, when released from internment is either to retire from politics or to side with moderate forms of agitation. Under the guidance of men like Subbas Chandra Bose, the country is more likely to come to a stable condition, in which reasonable terms of co-operation with Government may be thinkable rather than in the present confused state of the different factions. On the other hand, having regard to the complications due to the leaking out of Mulvany's report and the publication of the "Statesman's" correspondence, the detention of the political prisoners can only

cut at the roots of the prestige of the Government. The situation besides becomes ridiculous and farcical when any public organ, that characterises the detained political prisoners as revolutionaries is at once called to order and brought to book by the High Court of Justice. Policy and expediency if not justice alone demands that these political prisoners should now be released. If the Government think that such sudden release effected by way of a compromise will act prejudicially to their prestige, they may release them one by one or group by group, during the course of say next few months, without any pronouncement of reasons. All that we want is the release of all of them before the next elections.

The only other condition on which we would insist is that we be given proper scope and financial facilities in running the transferred departments. The mere passing of some trumpery or unworkable Act would not enlist the support of the people nor would it give satisfaction to our representatives in the Ministry itself. All that we want is that we be given a generous share of the present resources and thereafter left free to raise the deficiency by loan or tax or any other suitable means for the exclusive purpose of nation-building work, e.g., primary education, sanitation, etc.

You will concede that any such Ministry, if formed, will have to justify before the bar of public opinion by doing solid, substantial, and permanently beneficial work for the people of the province; mere schemes will not do, but they must be honestly and efficiently worked out and put into practice.

If Lord Lytton will clear up the atmosphere in regard to these two main points I think an effort may be made with every chance of success to induce the

Congress Party to form a Ministry after the next elections.

An opinion seems to be current in quarters that the Swarajists will go down in the next elections. You yourself are quite abreast of the popular feeling in the districts and therefore I take it you know how much value is to be attached to such opinion. Even after the riots and not withstanding the acute communal tension in the mofussal we are firm in our belief that the Liberals and Responsivists notwithstanding we shall be able to secure as many as 50 out of 57 Hindu seats. I again leave it to you out of your knowledge to form your personal opinion of the reasonableness of our belief. In spite of the undoubted acuteness of the communal tension, I am personally confident that by leaving the Mahomedans free to vote as they please on purely communal questions, we can get at least 20 of them on our side against the formation of a Ministry under the present conditions.

So much for our position. I cannot, however, conclude this letter without discussing the alternative to a Swarajist Ministry. If no terms are settled, and the Swarajists refuse to accept the Ministry, the only possible alternative that I can see is to have a purely Mahomedan Ministry formed by Sir Abdur Rahim.

The Mahomedans, even if all of them follow the lead of Sir Abdur, constitute only a body of thirty-nine members. Naturally, therefore, they will have to count, almost in every respect, upon the support of the official and European members. Or rather the Governor in inviting Sir Abdur to form the Ministry and thereby becoming pledged to support him, cannot but ask the official members and also for practical purposes the

European elected members who look to Government for their lead to vote with the Mahomedan Ministers. Thus fortified by the pledged support of the majority in the Council, Sir Abdur Rahim and his followers will take but little time to launch upon the most controversial of communal legislation. He will initiate separate communal representation in the local bodies and try perhaps successfully to divide the education grants among the two communities in such a manner as to prejudicially affect not only the Hindu but also his own community. This he will have to do if only to consolidate his influence for the time being amongst the Mahomedan community and to carry favour with his Mahomedan following. And the Government will necessarily become a party to these mischievous activities by way of legislation or departmental decrease. Thereupon the Hindu public, even the section of them so far in favour of the Government, will naturally be mortally offended, not only with the Moslems, but no less, perhaps even more, with the Government that would be nourishing and supporting them. This will create an atmosphere not in the least favourable to the success of any Government. Besides, it will hardly be possible for the Government to go all the way with Sir Abdur and his followers. They will have to cry halt somewhere, and as soon as unqualified support is thus refused to the Mahomedan Ministers their followers will begin to grumble and create mischief. With Hindu Opposition on one side and Mahomedan malcontents on the other, it will not be an enviable position for the Government.

There is also the possibility if no settlement is arrived at between the Government and the Swarajists and the latter stick to their policy of non-acceptance of Ministry, that it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for

the Government to form a Mahomedan or for the matter of that, any Ministry. As you know the Mahomedan members have hardly the chance of being unanimous in regard to the personnel of the Ministry. As you know well enough, if the Government could not form a stable Ministry during the last three years, that was only because there were acute personal quarrels amongst the Mahomedans themselves.

If you think that by means of any reasonable give-and-take there is a fair chance of a settlement being effected on the indicated lines, I shall be only too glad on so learning from you to do my humble best in its furtherance. You may also rely on whatever you may say or write to me being treated as strictly confidential. . .

Appendix B (2)

(BY M. ANNAPURNIAH, MEMBER, A. I, C. C.)

Ever since the dishonourable break down of the Sabarmati Pact, through the subtle genius of Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar of Madras, and particularly since his elevation to the Presidential 'gadi' of the All-India Swarajya Party, not by the suffrage of the members of the party thereof, but by the kind nomination of Pundit Motilal Nehru, there has been a controversy in the Press whether Mr. Iyengar did or did not give an assurance to the Nationalists in the Madras Legislative Council who have all along been refusing to touch Swarajist politics even with a pair of tongs, that he would see his way to work for the lifting up of the ban on offices, particularly Ministerships, at Assam. The controversy was first set on foot by the Telugu Nationalist weekly, the 'Satyagrahi' of Ellore, edited by Mr. Govinda Achary, a young man, who made great sacrifices for his country, and who, while in jail, fell seriously ill, but preferred death to dishonour and stoutly refused to secure his release by signing the security bond. I admit that I also took up the controversy in hand through my weekly, the "Congress". The acting leader of the Swarajya Party got wild at our exposures of his secret commitments on such vital public matters as the question of acceptance of office, and besides denying our allegations, went out of his way, and observed, at a meeting held on the Madras Beach to commemorate the sacred memory of Deshabandu Das, when all controversy should be forgotten, that some Telugu journals, presumably

those that mercilessly exposed him, were carrying on a propaganda in favour of the bureaucracy, instead of for the nation, and further declared in his arrogance, unbecoming a leader, albeit temporary, of the great Swarajya Party, that the sooner those journals were destroyed, the better it would be for the country. It is really amusing to see the stop-gap leader of the only "organised political party", in his intoxication of the newly acquired power, fondly imagining that every paper that exposes his whims and vagaries, his double dealing and duplicity, is anti-national and probureaucratic and hence needs to be crushed.

MR. IYENGAR AT SABARMATI

Before dealing with the controversy in question, let me say a few words regarding the part played by Mr. Iyengar in the dishonourable break-down of the Pact. I use the word dishonourable advisedly, for while I rejoice in the rejection of the Pact, the way in which it broke-down, was certainly dishonourable to the signatories of the Pact on behalf of the Congress. Let me take back the reader, for a little while, to the events of the first week of May. On the morning of the 4th May, we, the Andhra delegates, reached Sabarmati. By that time, Mr. Iyengar and his henchmen were already confabulating about how to oust Pundit Nehru from his leadership. Already, the talk of a new formula was in the air, and it was an open secret that Mr. Iyengar would be substituting the new formula for the Pact. This was considered by all to be a distinct bid for leadership on the part of Mr. Iyengar, and it was confirmed to us, at least in the Andhra camp, because Mr. Prakasam, our leader, brought a typed copy from Mr. Iyengar, containing the new formula and asked us to discuss it, and see whether we can lend our support to it, so that it may be substi-

tuted for the Pact. Indeed, there was great significance in seeking our support, for we were solidly against the Pact, and we were eleven, and combining with the Tamils, we formed a solid block of twenty in a house of about seventy only. At once we could scent the whole thing, and we resolved not to play into the hands of the subtle-brained Iyengar. Let us reject the Pact and straightway go home, was our decision. Mr. B. Sambamurty of Cocanada was particularly of this opinion, and we subscribed to his view. And what was this new formula ? It was none other than what Pundit Nehru sent to the Responsivist leaders, the same day, saying that that formula represented his interpretation of the Pact. It may also be re-called that it was on the lines of this new formula that Messrs. Sreenivasa Iyengar and Rangaswamy Iyengar gave an interview to the Free Press at Bombay, a day or two previous to the Sabarmati meeting, which was published in the Bombay papers, but was subsequently disowned by the Iyengars, who styled it a "manufactured interview." The interview was prior to the Iyengars' departure to Sabarmati, when they had hopes to get the new formula adopted ; the denial was made at Sabarmati, subsequent to the realisation that the new formula did not stand the chance of acceptance at the A.I.C.C. This new formula again formed thebasis of Punditji's different interpretation.

I owe an explanation to the public, as to why I refrained from giving publicity to this matter so long. I withheld it from the public out of respect for our leader Mr. Prakasam, who enjoined strict secrecy upon us at Sabarmati. I no longer feel the obligation to keep it secret, because advantage is taken even by Mr. Prakasam of this secrecy, and he has of late begun to defend the double-dealing of Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar. In the recent

meeting of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, over which he presided, he deliberately tried to cloud the issue by raising irrelevant questions of Andhra versus Tamil, which was not working in the mind of any member. Mr. Prakasam has been wantonly suppressing only other side of the discussion about Mr. Iyengar's nomination for the Assam Congress Presidentship, and arranging to see that only his speech defending Mr. Iyengar found its way into the columns of the "Swarajya" of which he is the editor and Mr. Iyengar a Director. Strangely enough, even Mr. Sambamurty's intelligent and pointed question to Mr. Govinda Achary whether or not, the statement issued by Mr. C.V.S. Narasimha Raju, the Madras Nationalist Leader, regarding the assurances of Mr. Iyengar to the Nationalists, contained the following definite words viz., "I am for acceptance of office, though I do not accept office myself," did not find its way into the columns of the "Swarajya". The Editor of the "Satyagrahi", of course, gave an emphatic "Yes" in reply.

IYENGAR AND NATIONALISTS

Let me now come to the ass rance of Mr. Iyengar to the Nationalists and particularly to their leader, Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Na asimha Raju, who whatever his politics might be, is universally known to be a man of unimpeachable honesty and integrity. Mr. Raju gave an interview to the Editor of the "Satyagrahi" regarding what passed between the Nationalists and Mr. Iyengar at Madras, and between Mr. Iyengar and himself at Sabarmati, at which the editor himself was present for a little while. The latest issue of the "Satyagrahi" published the interview in full. The interview speaks for itself. Here the interview is reproduced between Mr. Raju and the Editor of the "Satyagrahi". . . .

Thus ended the famous conversation between the Leader of the Nationalists of Madras and the Acting Leader of the Swarajya Party at Sabarmati. Let the reader note that the consultations at Madras were held in March, long before the Sabarmati Pact, and that the Sabarmati conversations were held but a day after the inglorious dissolution of the Pact for which Mr. Iyengar was not a little responsible. In both the conversations, he clearly held out assurances to the Nationalists that he would see to the lifting of the ban on offices, and he enunciated the ways and methods also of bringing about the desired change in the Congress programme. Let me now note the clause, wherein Mr. Iyengar said authority was created for the Congress to modify the programme at Assam and pass the policy of office—acceptance. It is as follows :—"That the next general elections will be run by and in the name of the Congress on the programme outlined, subject to such modifications as may be made by the Congress in December 1926." If we refresh our memory, we realise that the resolution containing the above clause was moved by Mr. Iyengar himself at Delhi, and if we also note, that Mr. Iyengar told Mr. Narasimha Raju (as the interview published above shows) that this clause was passed with a view to facilitate the acceptance of office by the Congress at Assam, the political honesty of the ex-Advocate-General of Madras would be as clear as crystal, even to the most superficial observer.

I do not propose to say more. But let me tell the reader that it was this same Iyengar who condemned Mr. A. Kaleswararao of Bezwada, who, as the then President of the Andhra Swarajya Party, had a talk with the Nationali-t leaders of Madras on the chances of unity between the Swarajists and the Nationalists.

It is indeed a strange irony of fate that the leader of the Responsivists, who openly pleaded for acceptance of office, spurns a High-Court Judgeship leading up to the Chief-Justiceship of Bombay, while the Acting Leader of the Swarajya Party, waxing eloquent, day in and day out, on the real and imaginary virtues of non-acceptance of office, should be holding out secret assurances about acceptance of office. And the former and his colleagues are to be branded as "rebels, traitors, office-hunters" and what not, and the latter to be raised to the Presidential gadi of the Indian National Congress at Assam, the grand place of honour occupied by Naoroji and Gokhale, Gandhi and Das, Lalji and Malaviyajee, and declined by Tilak in all humility.—(The "Mahratta.")

Appendix B (1)

With reference to the statement of Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, regarding Swarajists and acceptance of office, Mr. C. V. S. Narasimharaju writes :—

I have read with great surprise the statements of Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar and Mr. Satyamurthi reported in "The Hindu" of the 9th and 10th respectively regarding my interview with the Editor of the "Satyagrahi."

The statement of Mr. Satyamurthi clearly shows that he did not read the report of my interview and exhibits his great anxiety to corroborate Mr. Iyengar. It touches many irrelevant topics which have no bearing on the point at issue. Therefore it does not deserve any consideration by me or the public.

Mr. Iyengar has referred to the earlier conversation. Let me remind him that they were terminated with the exhibition of bad temper on either side at a party meeting held in the Mahajana Sabha Hall previous to December 1925, and that he invited me for further conversation in February last and that in response to this written invitation I had to visit him again. I have received one or two letters about this time from Mr. Muthiah Mudaliar describing the attitude of Mr. Iyengar or his friends regarding the removal of ban on office. Whatever the denials of Mr. Iyengar may be at present a publication of these letters which I shall be able to do soon after I return to Vizag may enable the public to understand the views of Mr. Iyengar and his friends regarding the removal of ban on office.